DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 470 UD 028 224

AUTHOR	Davidson, Mary E.; And Others
TITLE	The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's Quarterly Progress Report on Monitoring Project CANAL.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE	Aug 89
NOTE	166p.; For a complete set of Commission Reports, see UD 028 213-233.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Budgets; Community Control; Compliance (Legal); *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; *Management Development; *Participative Decision Making; *Program Budgeting; Program Evaluation; *School Based Management; *School Community Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Chicago Public Schools IL; Project CANAL

ABSTRACT

This quarterly report, covering February 1 through June 30, 1989, summarizes problems with Project Creating a New Approach to Learning (CANAL), part of a court-mandated desegregation plan to reduce inequities in predominantly Black and Hispanic American schools in Chicago (Illinois). CANAL's goal is to train the constituent representatives of the public schools to engage in shared decision-making and to develop organizational structures that incorporate the community in the organizational and educational processes of the schools. The CANAL Audit Ledger, a task and time accounting ledger, is used to determine the extent to which and the timeliness with which the following project elements are achieved: (1) student achievement; (2) shared governance; (3) school-based management; (4) staff development; (5) parent training; and (6) general program evaluation. The following problems with training, identified during site visits, are outlined: (1) unclear purpose of training activities; (2) unrepresentative composition of the core planning teams; (3) poor staff and program organization; (4) ineffective afternoon group workshops; (5) poor quality and use of presenters, consultants, and outside experts; (6) poor quality of training materials; and (7) inefficient training environment. A community case study approach has been developed to measure the contributions of CANAL to the goals of the desegregation plan. The following materials are appended: (1) the CANAL Audit Ledger and two accompanying analyses; (2) the observational analysis of CANAL training; (3) a discussion of the community case study; and (4) a review of the CANAL evaluation design. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT
ON
MONITORING PROJECT CANAL

Submitted to the United States Department of Education

August 1988

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

Doris P. Bailey
Commission Chairperson

[illegible] D. [illegible]
[illegible]
General Superintendent of Schools
Chicago Public Schools

UD 028 224

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Leibens-Osiloja
Monitoring Comm
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Donn F. Bailey, Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate
Maxine Duster
Mari Fohrman
Carlos Heredia
Gwendolyn Laroche
Henry Martinez
Jesse Miller
Uthman Muhammad
Donnell Peterson
George Riddick
Aida Sanchez
Darthula Young

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Mary E. Davidson

COMMISSION STAFF

Regina Horton
Helen Jackson
Barb Leebens-Osilaja
Jesse Qualls
Christy Spears
Ana Tapia

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
1819 West Pershing Road
6th Floor East
Chicago, Illinois 60609
(312) 890-8220

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION'S

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

ON

MONITORING PROJECT CANAL

Submitted to the United States Department of Education

August 1989

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

Donn F. Bailey
Commission Chairperson

Charles D. Almo
Interim
General Superintendent of Schools
Chicago Public Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE OF REPORT 1

COMMISSION MONITORING STRATEGY 1

MONITORING COMMISSION ACTIONS 2
  Compliance Monitoring 2

  CANAL Audit Ledger 2-6
    Student Achievement 4
    Shared Governance 4
    School-Based Management 4
    Staff Development 5
    Parent Training 5
    General Evaluation 6

  Non-Participant Observational Analysis 6
    Purpose of Training Activities (Problem One) 7
    Core Planning Teams' Composition (Problem Two) 8-9
    Program and Staff Organization (Problem Three) 9
    Afternoon Group Workshops (Problem Four) 9
    Presenters, Consultants, Outside Experts (Problem Five) 10
    Quality of Training Materials (Problem Six) 10
    Training Environment (Problem Seven) 10

  Commission Research-Based Monitoring 10-12

  Case Study Design 12-13

  Commission Liaison with Department of Research and Evaluation . . . 13-14

  Monitoring Commission Staff 14

  Budget Status 14

APPENDICES 15-140

APPENDICES

Appendix A: CANAL Audit Ledger 16

Appendix B: Commission Analysis of DEEOP's Response to Audit Ledger Status 48

Appendix C: Commission's Observational Analysis of CANAL Training 56

Appendix D: A Community Study Concept - Case Study Schools Data 100

Appendix E: Review of CANAL Evaluation Design 117

Appendix F: Monitoring Commission Staff 136

Appendix G: Budget Status 138

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The following materials are submitted by the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation under the reporting requirements of the Project CANAL. The report, with corresponding monitoring products, covers activities for expenditures from February 1, 1989, through June 30, 1989. Special attention should be paid to Appendices, B, C and D, assessment of CANAL Audit Ledger, the on-site monitoring and the community study. Detailed discussions are presented in the appendices.

COMMISSION MONITORING STRATEGY

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's activities of the Project CANAL during this reporting period were organized around four distinct foci including:

1. The **compliance monitoring function** which is concerned with the extent to which CANAL activities comply with the funded CANAL proposal.

2. The **non-participant monitoring function** which is based on direct observations of the interactions of CANAL training staff and their consultants with members of the core planning teams of the local schools participating in CANAL.

3. The **performance outcome monitoring function** which assesses whether the changes in human behavior occur that were anticipated by the Project CANAL.

4. The **research documentation monitoring function** which evaluates whether the long-term goals of CANAL are being realized. The long-term goals include: increased school-community interaction; the presence of shared governance in the local participating schools; the existence of school-based management; and, more positive attitudes on the part of all relevant constituencies regarding performance in the local school.

MONITORING COMMISSION ACTIONS

The Monitoring Commission Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Project CANAL continues to exercise oversight of the monitoring activities associated with CANAL.

Compliance Monitoring

The Monitoring Commission has categorized its inquiries and communications regarding CANAL into eight specific emphases. The monitoring of CANAL is organized around the eight areas over the five-year term of the Project. The activities are:

1. The management of the Project CANAL;
2. Student effects;
3. Parent effects;
4. Teacher and staff effects;
5. School climate impact;
6. Governance effects;
7. Westinghouse High School effects; and
8. Model Cluster School effects.

CANAL Audit Ledger

In order to monitor implementation of the Project CANAL, the Monitoring Commission has developed a task and time accounting ledger. The CANAL Audit Ledger is being used to determine the extent to which and timeliness with which elements of the Project CANAL are achieved. The task and timeline ledger is based on the original proposal that was approved and is organized around the enabling activities of CANAL and their specific timelines.

The CANAL Audit Ledger consists of a set of forms that the Commission requires the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs staff to complete on their progress of implementing CANAL activities.

Appendix A contains an example of the Ledger created by Commission staff based on their analysis of the goals and subgoals of the approved proposal. Each goal and subgoal of CANAL has associated enabling activities that have been identified as instrumental to achieving the goals and subgoals. In addition, the goals and subgoals have timelines that define the period of time available for each activity. The goals and subgoals contained in the proposal also have related evaluative activities too and timelines to be met by DEEOP and the Board of Education's Department of Research and Evaluation.

On March 14, 1989, the Monitoring Commission requested that the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs (DEEOP) provide an update on 78 separate promised enabling activities and promised evaluations. The Monitoring Commission requested DEEOP to complete the CANAL Audit Ledgers as evidence of the degree of program compliance with the approved proposal. The response was requested by April 15, 1989, but did not arrive from DEEOP until June 29, 1989.

The CANAL Audit Ledgers requested responses during this quarter covering six specific goals. These goals were: (1) student achievement; (2) shared governance; (3) school-based management; (4) staff development; (5) parent training; and (6) general program evaluation. Detailed discussion appears in Appendix B.

(1) Student Achievement

The request consisted of five enabling activities and six related evaluations that should have occurred with respect to this goal. The DEEOP response indicated that none of the five enabling activities or the six evaluations were completed on schedule, or, for that matter, at the date of the request. DEEOP indicated that the tasks would be completed by August 31, 1993.

Apparently, they assumed that the it would be sufficient to report in terms of the final project deadlines. Subsequent communications have clarified the intent of the audit monitoring instrument.

In part the delay in meeting deadlines is due to the delay in funding Project CANAL. Funds were received in late September 1989 rather than early summer. The funding delay postponed the start of program activities and made it impossible to meet the deadlines established in the original proposal.

However, some of the enabling activities, such as the training modules, should have been completed early in the program and would have little value if left undone until 1993. For a full report on the response see Appendix B.

(2) Shared Governance

For the goal of shared governance DEEOP reported a better completion rate in that DEEOP anticipates that all of the proposed training activities, while delayed, will be completed by August 31, 1989. The completed activities reported on the CANAL Audit Ledger included the more formal program requirements such as site selections, organization and delivery of training, development of core planning teams and the like.

However, the Monitoring Commission's on-site observational analyses note a number of problems in these areas which are detailed later in this report. Other areas of concern related to principal, teacher, and staff interactions, the development of teacher-peer support groups, parent liaisons, and the monitoring of shared decision-making practices within the local schools. A more detailed discussion of these issues is available in Appendix B.

(3) School-Based Management

Several concerns relate to the development of the model for school-based management through the core planning teams. The creation and operations of the core planning teams are of concern to the Commission. For example, representativeness of the core planning teams, the lack of a review process for training materials, and the failure to appoint an outside review panel to assess the modules all represent problems as detailed in Appendix B.

(4) Staff Development

DEEOP responses reported on the CANAL Audit Ledger forms indicated that activities related to the staff development goal are progressing. Nevertheless, some of the areas of concern remain and are outlined in Appendix B.

(5) Parent Training

Action on parent training was reported by DEEOP to be delayed at this point in time. The matter of inactivity regarding parental involvement continues to be of major concern to the Commission.

(6) General Evaluation

The general evaluation of CANAL, which is the responsibility of the Board of Education's Department of Research and Evaluation remains problematic. While a number of individual questionnaires and instruments are being used to collect data, the evaluation is not supported by an overall evaluation design that lends coherence to the data collection. Moreover, there is no design indicating how progress towards the short and long-term goals of CANAL is being evaluated.

Non-Participant Observational Analysis

An important part of the Monitoring Commission's monitoring function is an observational study of the implementation of CANAL's effort to train and organize the core planning teams of each school to assume the primary responsibility for assuring school-based management.

The core planning teams are intended to represent the primary constituencies of the local schools including principals, teachers, ancillary staff, students, parents, and community members. A primary activity of CANAL in the initial period of the Project was training the core planning teams for their role.

The training activities of CANAL are observed by staff of the Monitoring Commission to provide an assessment of the training. Thus far, staff observers have participated in orientation training, school-based management/shared decision-making training, day one, and day two, training for school-based evaluators, training for principals, parent's orientation, CANAL Advisory Committee meetings, and total site training (total site training involves an entire school and its staff).

In addition, the Monitoring Commission staff have observed the preparation of a cadre of substitute teachers who move from school to school to relieve teachers and staff who are participating in total site training. These observations included both the training of the cadre and their actual practice as substitutes.

The observational materials for orientation and school-based/shared decision-making, days one and two have been analyzed and the full report of the analysis is attached in Appendix C. A brief summary of the observational findings discussed below indicates that CANAL experienced several problems in initiating the original intent of the proposal. Seven specific problems are described below and discussed in greater detailed in Appendix C.

Purpose of Training Activities (Problem One)

The purpose of the orientation training and day one and two of the school-based management/shared decision-making training was to prepare the core planning teams of each school to take the lead in school-based management as proposed in CANAL.

The assumption was that the core teams would consist of representatives of the primary constituents of the local schools who would lead the way in restructuring school governance with the ultimate goal of improving the level of academic achievement. A key component of school-based management is a planning body made up of representatives of all the primary groups in the educational system.

The critical role of the core teams regarding the hopes for changing student achievement, places a heavy burden on the shoulders of the team. The training activities of CANAL are intended to provide the core teams with the content, skills and motivation necessary to meet their responsibilities. Thus, the training, both in terms of its content and participants, is vital to the success of CANAL.

Based on the Monitoring Commission's observational evaluation, serious difficulties threaten the capacity of the training program to meet its obligations in training the core planning teams.

Some of the major problems related to the training include: the non-representative composition of the core planning teams, the general state of readiness of the training staff, the ineffectiveness of group activities during training, issues related to the use of outside presenters, the quality of the training materials, and general issues related to the quality of the environment in which the training takes place.

Core Planning Teams' Composition (Problem Two)

The representation of the core planning teams has not lived up to the expectations of CANAL. The orientation sessions indicated that the core team members mainly consisted of teachers and their principals. While there was limited representation of some ancillary staff, the various staff central to the functioning of the school did not participate in the training. Even less represented were the parents and least represented were members of the community.

Given the delay in funding and all the problems associated with initiating a major undertaking like CANAL, it was not surprising that the orientation sessions fell short of expectations in terms of representing the primary constituents. Also, it would be expected that as the program evolved, the issue of representation would be addressed.

However, rather than improve over time, matters worsened, and at least in terms of attendance, the core teams became less representative by day two training. Moreover, even the number of teachers declined somewhat so that overall attendance at core team training sessions decreased rather than increased. Not only did the poor attendance indicate that the development of teams that could represent the key actors in school-based management did not materialize, but the effort expended on providing the basic skills for school-based management and shared decision-making primarily reached teachers.

Program and Staff Organization (Problem Three)

The general state of readiness of the training staff and program left much to be desired. At the beginning of the three training sequences, orientation, day one and day two training, the staff and consultants seemed unprepared and uncertain. The training sessions suffered from poor organization and inadequate preparation.

Because of the initial lack of preparation, schools involved in the early days of each of the three training sequences had training of lesser quality than did the schools appearing later in the schedule. As it turned out, nine schools were involved in early sessions of all three training sequences. Likely, this will have an impact on the capacities of their core planning teams.

Afternoon Group Workshops (Problem Four)

The afternoon group sessions, that were to serve as workshops in which the core planning teams could apply the concepts learned in the morning lectures, were the weakest part of the training program. Given that the afternoon sessions were an opportunity to build skills in school-based management and shared decision-making under supervision, they were a vital part of the training. The staff and consultants did not appear to approach the task with the effort or skills required for effective workshops.

Presenters, Consultants, Outside Experts (Problem Five)

The presenters, consultants and outside experts were changed from session to session with no rationale or regard to training needs. There was considerable variation in the knowledge, emphasis and content of the message, and presentational skills. Thus, the quality and content of the training varied unnecessarily with indeterminate effects on the intended outcome.

Quality of Training Materials (Problem Six)

The quality of the training materials did not meet ordinary professional standards. Inadequate editing, poor copies, video materials that were in bad repair, and inadequate effort to assure appropriate viewing and hearing of materials presented, all interfered with the training mission. Not only did the poor quality of the materials have a direct effect on the sessions, but indirectly, it was in direct contradiction to the goals of CANAL, to promote high standards for academic achievement.

Training Environment (Problem Seven)

Finally, the quality of the training environment was problematic in spite of the rehabilitation of the physical facility. Poor control of room temperatures, noise and marginal acoustics, the use of an auditorium that was not conducive to interaction, all compounded the difficulties of the training experience.

Commission Research-Based Monitoring

The Monitoring Commission is undertaking its own research to more directly evaluate the impact of Project CANAL. The research will consist of a case study of three schools, a school with a predominantly Hispanic student body, one with a predominantly black student body, and a control school.

The theoretical framework used to organize the study will be an action system analysis. Thus, the local school and its community will be treated as an action system. The activities and exchanges of the components will be analyzed to evaluate the impact of CANAL on the action system over the five-year period of the project and the relationship, if any, to student achievement. Appendix D provides a more detailed description of the research framework. Some of the key organizing questions are:

1. To what extent do perceptions and expectations among the different constituencies of the local school action system confuse or clarify CANAL objectives? Are differences in perception of what CANAL should and will achieve instrumental to its impact? And, how do the differences effect the ongoing implementation of desegregation?

2. To what degree are students, parents, school staff, school administrators, community leaders, and other critical actors in the local school action system in agreement that CANAL is functioning so as to fulfill the desegregation plans of racially identifiable schools?

3. To what extent do school improvement councils facilitate or impede the efforts of the core planning teams in CANAL schools to involve a broad base of parents in school management?

4. To what extent do Board of Education policies and school reform initiatives hinder or contribute to the successful implementation of desegregation goals in CANAL schools?

5. Are there differences in levels of agreement regarding the contributions of CANAL to desegregation across the local school system within predominantly Hispanic and predominantly black schools?

Case Study Design

The case study design is moving forward, see Appendix D. The three schools have been selected, and currently data describing the communities of each school is being collected. The various elements of each of the case study schools and their communities are being described in terms of:

1. The students, their social characteristics and academic performance. Additionally, data on academic performance will include retrospective data for each class on their academic performance from their first year of school to the present, and prospective data through the five-year period of CANAL.

2. Data describing faculty and non-administrative staff. Both their socio-demographic characteristics and their professional performance will be evaluated. Teachers and staff will be followed over the five-year study period.

3. Administrative staff also will be described in terms of their socio-demographic characteristics and their job performance.

4. The school also will be described with regard to its characteristics, history, organizational makeup and organizational activities, and its formal and informal ties to individuals and organizations in the community.

5. The community in which each school is located also will be described including basic social and economic characteristics, political, business, religious, voluntary, and other organizations.

6. CANAL data also will be used where relevant to an analysis of the action system of the school.

Much of the background and basic descriptive data collection is underway. For a more complete description of the data elements see Appendix D.

Commission Liaison with Department of Research and Evaluation

The Commission has held periodic meetings with the Department of Research and Evaluation (R & E) to monitor the progress on evaluating the Project CANAL. The meetings have included the principal investigator of the Monitoring Commission, primary consultants to the Commission, as well as the liaison from the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs. The Commission forwarded to the assistant superintendent, responsible for implementing CANAL, and to the director of the Department of Research and Evaluation, a statement incident to the Commission's monitoring of CANAL as mandated by the Board Resolution 86-0611-RS2.

The sessions with R & E have been primarily focused on the development of a research design(s) that will assure evaluation of both the short- and long-term impacts of CANAL. While R & E has developed and implemented a number of instruments designed to evaluate various activities of CANAL, the development of a conceptually-based design has not yet been produced. Appendix E contains examples of the comments of the Commission in response to the modified research design provided by

R & E and contained in the DEEOP CANAL Quarterly Progress Report. It showed be noted that the Commission's principal investigator can report that significant collaborative progress has been made since July 1, 1989, and that this progress will be reported upon in the Commission's year end CANAL Progress report.

Monitoring Commission Staff

The primary staff responsible for monitoring the Project CANAL are the principal investigator of the Monitoring Commission, primary consultants, and full-time Commission staff remain unchanged from the previous quarterly report.

Budget Status

For a complete breakdown of the Monitoring Commission's budget to monitor Project CANAL, please see Appendix G.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CANAL AUDIT LEDGER

Abbreviation Key 17
Audit Ledger 18
Extracted Enabling and Evaluative
Activities (Pages 65-74 of Proposal) 24
Samples of DEEOP's Audit Ledger Responses 38

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

Abbreviation Key to the CANAL Audit Ledger

EA:	Enabling Activities
EV:	Evaluation
G.GEV:	General Evaluation
OBJ:	Objective
OR/EV:	Overall Evaluation
PG:	Project Goal
PT:	Parent Training
SBM:	School-Based Management
SD:	Staff Development
SG:	Subgoal
ST:	Student (General Evaluation)

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

CANAL Audit Ledger

1988-89

Goals/Page	Enabling Activities	Evaluative Activities	Date	Time Status Implementation	Completion
PG 1 (pp.33-34)	EA 1	EV 1	Summer '88	Fall '89	Aug. '93
	EA 2	EV 2	Summer '88	Fall '89	Aug. '93
		EV 3	Summer '88	Fall '89	Aug. '93
		EV 4	Summer '88	Fall '89	Aug. '93
	EA 3	EV 5	Fall '88	Fall '89	Aug. '93
	EA 4	EV 6	Fall '88	Fall '89	Aug. '93
	EA 5	EV 6	Summer '88	Fall '89	Aug. '93
		OR/EV 7(p.34)		Fall '89	
		OR/EV 8(p.34)		Fall '89	
SG 1, Obj. 1 (pp.35-37)	EA 1	EV 1	Spring '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 2	EV 2	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 3	EV 2	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 4	EV 3	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 5	EV 4	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 6	EV 5	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 7	EV 5	Fall '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 8	EV 5	Fall '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 9	EV 5	Fall '88	Fall '88	
		OR/EV 6	Fall '88		Aug. '89
		OR/EV 7	Fall '88		Aug. '89
		OR/EV 8		May '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 9		May '88	Aug. '89

Goals/Page	Enabling Activities	Evaluative Activities	Date	Implementation	Completion
(PG 1 cont.)					
SG 1, Obj. 2	EA 1	EV 1	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
(pp.39-42)	EA 2	EV 2	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 3	?	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 4	EV 3	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 5	EV 4	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 6	EV 5	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 7	EV 6	Summer '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 8	EV 6	Fall '88	May '88	Aug. '89
	EA 9	EV 7	Fall '88	May '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 8		May '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 9		May '88	Aug. '89
SG 1 Obj. 3	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88	Fall '88	Aug. '89
(pp.43-44)	EA 2	EV 1	Fall '88	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 3	EV 2	Fall '88	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 4	EV 3	Fall '88	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 5	EV 4	Fall '88	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 6	EV 5	Fall '88('89)	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 7	EV 5	(Fall '88)	Fall '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 6		Fall '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 7		Fall '88	Aug. '89
SG 2, Obj. 1	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88	Sept. '88	Aug. '89
(pp.45-46)	EA 2	EV 1	Ongoing	Sept. '88	Aug. '89
	EA 3	EV 2	Fall '88	Sept. '88	Nov. '89
	EA 4	EV 3	Ongoing	Sept. '88	Aug. '89
	EA 5	EV 3	Ongoing	Sept. '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 4		Sept. '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 5		Sept. '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 6		Sept. '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 7		Sept. '88	Aug. '89

Goals/Page	Enabling Activities	Evaluative Activities	Date	Implementation	Completion
SG 2, Obj. 2	EA 1	EV 1	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '88(89)
(pp.47-48)	EA 2	EV 2	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '88(89)
	EA 2	EV 3	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '88(89)
	EA 3	EV 4	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '88(89)
	EA 4	EV 5	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '88(89)
	EA 5	EV 6		Fall '88	Aug. '88(89)
		OR/EV 7		Fall '88	Aug. '88(89)
		OR/EV 8		Fall '88	Aug. '88(89)
SG 2, Obj. 3	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88	Fall '88	Ongoing
(pp.49-50)	EA 2	EV 1	Ongoing	Fall '88	Ongoing
		OR/EV 2		Fall '88	Ongoing
		OR/EV 3		Fall '88	Ongoing
SG 2, Obj. 4	EA 1	EV 1		Fall '88	Ongoing
(pp.51-52)	EA 2	EV 3		Fall '88	Ongoing
		OR/EV 2		Fall '88	Ongoing
		OR/EV 4		Fall '88	Ongoing
		OR/EV 5		Fall '88	Ongoing
SG 3, Obj. 1	EA 1	EV 1		Fall '88	Aug. '89
(pp.54-56)	EA 2	EV 1	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 3	EV 2	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 4	EV 2	Fall '88	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 5	EV 3	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 6	EV 4		Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 7	EV 5	Fall '88	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 8	EV 6	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 9	EV 7	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 8		Fall '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 9		Fall '88	Aug. '89

Goals/Page	Enabling Activities	Evaluative Activities	Date	Implementation	Completion
SG 3, Obj. 2	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88	Fall '88	Aug. '89
(pp.57-58)	EA 2	EV 2	Fall '88	Fall '88	March '89
	EA 3	EV 2	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 4	EV 2	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 5	EV 3	Ongoing	Fall '88	Aug. '89
	EA 6	EV 4		Fall '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 5		Fall '88	Aug. '89
		OR/EV 6		Fall '88	Aug. '89
SG 4, Obj. 1	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '90	Fall '89	Aug. '93
(pp.59-60)	EA 2	EV 1		Fall '89	Aug. '93
	EA 3	EV 2	Fall '90	Fall '89	Aug. '93
	EA 4	EV 3	Fall '90	Fall '89	Aug. '93
	EA 5	EV 4	Fall '90	Fall '89	Aug. '93
		OR/EV 5		Fall '89	Aug. '93
		OR/EV 6		Fall '89	Aug. '93
SBM GEV I	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88		
(p.65)	EA 2	EV 2	Fall '88		
	EA 3	EV 3	Fall '88		
SBM GEV II (p.65)	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88		
SBM GEV III	EA 1	EV 1	Spring '89		
(p.66)	EA 2	EV 2	Spring '89		
	EA 3	EV 3	Spring '89		
SBM GEV IV (P.66)	EA 1	EV 1	Winter '89		

Goals/Page	Enabling Activities	Evaluative Activities	Date	Implementation	Completion
SBM GEV V (p.66)	EA 1	EV 1	Winter '89		
	EA 2	EV 2	Spring '89		
	EA 3	EV 3	Spring '89		
	EA 4	EV 4	Spring '89		
	EA 5	EV 5	Spring '89		
	EA 6	EV 6	Spring '89		
	EA 7	EV 7	Winter '92		
SBM GEV VI (p.68)	EA 1	EV 1	Annually		
	EA 2	EV 2	Annually		
	EA 3	EV 3	Annually		
	EA 4	EV 4	Annually		
	EA 5	EV 5	Annually		
SD GEV I (p.69)	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88		
SD GEV II (p.69)	EA 1	EV 1	Ongoing		
	EA 2	EV 2	Semi-Annual		
	EA 3	EV 3	Semi-Annual		
	EA 4	EV 4	Annually		
	EA 5	EV 5	Annually		
SD GEV III (p.70)	EA 1 (Achievement)	EV 1 (Gen.)	Annually		
PT GEV I (p.71)	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88		
PT GEV II (p.71)	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88		

Goals/Page	Enabling Activities	Evaluative Activities	Date	Implementation	Completion
PT GEV III (p.71)	EA 1	EV 1	Annually		
	EA 2	EV 2	Annually/Spring '89		
	EA 3	EV 3	Annually/Spring '89		
ST GEV I (p.72)	EA 1	EV 1	Annually		
	EA 2	EV 2	Annually/Spring '90		
G GEV I (p.73)	EA 1	EV 1	Spring '89		
	EA 2	EV 2	Spring '89		
G GEV II (p.73)	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88		
G GEV III (p.73)	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88		
G GEV IV (p.74)	EA 1	EV 1	Fall '88		
G GEV V ((p.74)	EA 1	EV 1	Summer '88		
G GEV VI ((p.74)	EA 1	EV 1	Summer '89		
G GEV VII (p.74)	EA 1	EV 1	Summer '90/Annually		
G GEV VIII (p.74)	EA 1	EV 1	Summer '93		

Extracted from pages 65 through 74 of CANAL Proposal

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
SBM. GEV I, EA1:	Appoint panel of experts to assess training modules using criteria a-h. (p.65)	SBM. GEV I, EV1:	Describe the process and individuals making up the panel of experts. (p.65)	Fall 1988
SBM. GEV I, EA2:	Have panel describe further training needs. (p.65)	SBM. GEV I, EV2:	Document additional training needs noted by panel. (p.65)	Fall 1988
SBM. GEV I, EA3:	Have panel note omissions in training modules. (p.65)	SBM. GEV I, EV3:	Document noted omissions and suggested resolutions. (p.65)	Fall 1988
SBM. GEV II, EA1:	Develop a survey to assess Core Team's perspective of training modules. (p.65)	SBM. GEV II, EV1:	Report the analysis and results of the survey. (p.65)	Fall 1988

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
SBM. GEV III, EA1:	Assess Core Team's participation in school improvement plan needs assessment. (p.66)	SBM. GEV III, EV1:	Report the results of the assessment. (p.66)	Spring 1989
SBM. GEV III, EA2:	Appraise each school's needs assessment package for completeness. (p.66)	SBM. GEV III, EV2:	Report the results of the appraisal. (p.66)	Spring 1989
SBM. GEV III, EA3:	Appraise shared decision-making. (p.66)	SBM. GEV III, EV3:	Describe participants and process for participation. (p.66)	Spring 1989
SBM. GEV IV, EA1:	Survey Core Team members to see if they know the content or are unable to use it for modules. (p.66)	SBM. GEV IV, EV1:	Report the results of the survey. (p.66)	Winter 1989

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
SBM. GEV V, EA1:	Survey Core Team to see if shared decision-making and consensus occurred. (p.66)	SBM. GEV V, EV1:	Report the results of the survey. (p.66)	Winter 1989
SBM. GEV V, EA2:	Assess involvement of staff, parents, or students in SIP (school improvement plan). (p.66)	SBM. GEV V, EV2:	Report results of the assessment. (p.66)	Spring 1989
SBM. GEV V, EA3:	Assess potential of plan to increase student achievement using eight criteria listed. (p.67)	SBM. GEV V, EV3:	Report results of the assessment. (p.67)	Spring 1989

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
SBM. GEV V, EA4:	Assess the presence of specific objectives and how they will be met for each SIP. (p.67)	SBM. GEV V, EV4:	Report results of the assessment. (p.67)	Spring 1989
SBM. GEV V, EA5:	Assess whether the plan has an evaluation strategy. (p.67)	SBM. GEV V, EV5:	Provide a copy of the evaluation strategy. (p.67)	Spring 1989
SBM. GEV V, EA6:	Assess fit of budget to SIP and CANAL goals. (p.67)	SBM. GEV V, EV6:	Report results of the assessment of the budget fit to SIP and CAÑAL goals. (p.67)	Spring 1989
SBM. GEV V, EA7:	Develop plans for long-term financial maintenance of the program. (p.67)	SBM. GEV V, EV7:	Describe and analyze the financial plan across schools for post-CANAL funding. (p.67)	Winter 1992

	Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities	Time Status
SBM. GEV VI, EA1:	Each year, randomly observe Core Team meetings to determine compliance regulations with rules process. (p.68)	SBM. GEV VI, EV1:	Report schedule and results of random observations. (P.68)	Annually
SBM. GEV VI, EA2:	Develop focus groups that Core Teams use to increase participation of community. (p.68)	SBM. GEV VI, EV2:	Document the development and activities of focus groups. (p.68)	Annually
SBM. GEV VI, EA3:	Core Teams will provide quarterly progress reports on their activities. (p.68)	SBM. GEV VI, EV3:	Document the submission of reports and evaluate the appropriateness of their content. (p.68)	Annually

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
SBM. GEV VI, EA4:	Principal will submit an evaluation of project assistance to the school program. (p.68)	SBM. GEV VI, EV4:	Report on frequency, appropriateness and content of principals' evaluations. (p.68)	Annually
SBM. GEV VI, EA5:	Each project school will be visited annually by a certification team of consultants, district staff and project/DEEOP staff to assess records of all Core Team activities. (p.68)	SBM. GEV VI, EV5:	Report the certification team's findings. (p.68)	Annually
SD. GEV I, EA1:	Each training module, once completed will be reviewed by the panel of experts. (p.69)	SD. GEV I, EV1:	Document the evaluation of each training module. (p. 69)	Fall 1988

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
SD. GEV II, EA1:	Participating school staff will evaluate each training center's module presentation. (p.69)	SD. GEV II, EV1:	Report the results of evaluations of participating school staff. (p.69)	Ongoing
SD. GEV II, EA2:	Random samples of teachers' classrooms will be used to observe and assess teachers' performance each semester by trained personnel. (p.69)	SD. GEV II, EV2:	Report the results of the observations. (p.69)	Semi-Annual
SD. GEV II, EA3:	Each semester a focus group of teachers and principals across project schools will be assembled to discuss the program and problems. (p.69)	SD. GEV II, EV3:	Report the content and results of the focus group discussions. (p.69)	Semi-Annual

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
SD. GEV II, EA4:	At the end of each year, school staff will be surveyed with a questionnaire on the effective schools factors. (p.69)	SD. GEV II, EV4:	Report the results of the questionnaire survey. (p.69)	Annually
SD. GEV II, EA5:	Survey 6, 7 and 8 grades to assess their perceptions of the instructional atmospheres each Spring. (p.69)	SD. GEV II, EV5:	Report the results of the student survey. (p.69)	Annually
SD. GEV III, EA1:	Using quartiles, move students from lower to upper quartiles, 5% of first, 10% of second, 5% of third. (p.70)	SD. GEV III EV1:	Report the results of the movement of students across quartiles. (p.70)	Annually after year 1

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
PT. GEV I, EA1:	Appoint a panel of expert consultants to review parent education training modules. (p.71)	PT. GEV I, EV1:	Report results of the panels evaluations. (p.71)	Fall 1988
PT. GEV II, EA1:	Parent-participants will evaluate content and presentation style of each training module. (p.71)	PT. GEV II, EV1:	Report the results of parent-participant evaluations using three criteria specifiers. (p.71)	Fall 1988
PT. GEV III, EA1:	Convene parent participants into focus groups each Spring to discuss relevance of prior modules. (p.71)	PT. GEV III, EV1:	Report the results of annual focus group meetings. (p.71)	Annually

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
PT. GEV III, EA2:	Assess parent perceptions on methods of procedures for their involvement in school governance. (p.71)	PT. GEV III, EV2:	Document parent responses. (p.71)	Annually Beginning Spring 1989
PT. GEV III, EA3:	Assess parent knowledge of local Core Planning Team efforts. (p.71)	PT. GEV III, EV3:	Report parent perceptions. (p.71)	Annually Beginning Spring 1989
ST. GEV I, EA1:	Each Spring convene students of Core Planing Teams as focus groups to discuss their perception of involvement in shared governance. (p.72)	ST. GEV I, EV1:	Report the results of the annual student focus groups. (p.72)	Annually

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
ST. GEV I, EA2:	Each Spring, survey non-student members of Core Teams regarding the value of student members in Core Teams. (p.72)	ST. GEV I, EV2:	Report results of survey. (p. 72)	Annually Beginning Spring 1990
G. GEV I, EA1:	Establish a plan to evaluate student performances using matched and non-matched test scores in each program school with first evaluation three years post participation to assess its progress towards goal. (p.73)	G. GEV I, EV1:	Record analytic model for assessing performance and report actual changes over life of program. (p.73)	Provide Plan in Spring 1989

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
G. GEV I, EA2:	Develop models for comparing project gains with relevant non-CANAL schools. (p.73)	G. GEV I, EV2:	Report models and actual comparison results as they are produced. (p.73)	Spring 1989
G. GEV II, EA1:	Develop instrument to collect baseline data annually, beginning Summer 1988 on school attendance, student discipline, honor-roll. (p.73)	G. GEV II, EV1:	Report the baseline data annually. (p.73)	Beginning Summer 1988
G. GEV III, EA1:	Develop form for collecting annual staff attendance data beginning the first year. (p.73)	G. GEV III, EV1:	Report the annual staff attendance data. (p.73)	Fall 1988

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
G. GEV IV, EA1:	Beginning year 1, develop forms to log volunteers and volunteer hours annually by participating school each year. (p.74)	G. GEV IV, EV1:	Report the results of logs annually. (p.74)	Fall 1988
G. GEV V, EA1:	Beginning Summer 1988, collect baseline data on Westinghouse student enrollment, program completeness, dropouts, employment, post-graduate enrollment for training and education. (p.74)	G. GEV V, EV1:	Report results of Westinghouse baseline data. (p.74)	Summer 1988

Enabling Activities		Evaluative Activities		Time Status
G. GEV VI, EA1:	Tabulate transfers from over-utilized to model cluster schools beginning with schools' participation in CANAL. (p.74)	G. GEV VI, EV1:	Report student transfer results. (p.74)	Summer 1989
G. GEV VII, EA1:	Beginning second year of school participation, log students' participation in academic competitions. (p.74)	G. GEV VII, EV1:	Report changes in academic competition (p.74)	Summer 1990 and Annually
G. GEV VIII, EA1:	Identify and measure indicators of school climate; monitor and document changes toward the ideal. (p.74)	G. GEV VIII, EV1:	Report the plan and results of monitoring changes in school climate indicators. (p.74)	Summer 1993

/ 3/14/89

/ ____

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

CANAL AUDIT: ENABLING ACTIVITIES

1988-89

I. CANAL Program Action: PG-1, EA-2, EV-4 (pp.33-34)

EA-2

By Summer 1988, training modules will exist for project principals and teachers in the use of criterion referenced tests and teacher-made tests to provide feedback on student progress and to adjust teaching strategies to conform to test results.

EV-4

Presence of adjusted teaching strategies in response to feedback on tests.

II. Completion Date: Original 08 / 31 / 1993; Revised ____/____/____

III. Completion Status:

____Completed on____/____/____

X Not completed

X In progress; Expected date of completion 08 / 31 / 1993

____Not yet initiated

Resources necessary for completion

IV. Additional Comments:

PROJECT ACTIVITY

Principals and teachers received training in the use of criterion referenced tests and teacher-made tests to provide feedback on student progress and adjusting teaching strategies to conform with test results in training sessions led by Dr. Rodgers.

PG-1, EA-2, EV-4

Monitoring for presence of adjusted teaching strategies in response to feedback on tests will coincide with the 1989-90 training.

1 3/14/89

7 ____________

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

CANAL AUDIT: ENABLING ACTIVITIES

1988-89

I. CANAL Program Action: SG-1, OBJ-1, EA-5, EV-4 (pp.36-37)

EA-5

By Summer 1988, Training Center staff will have assisted local schools in performing an assessment of training needs in order to ensure that training modules offered at the Training Center are responsive to the needs of local schools.

The content of the training modules will be reviewed by the project director to ensure that each is concordant with the aims of the project and supportive of removing barriers to the performance of underachieving students.

EV-4

By late Summer 1988, evaluate the fit between assessed training needs and the modules developed to meet the needs.

II. Completion Date: Original 08 / 31 / 89 ; Revised ____/____/____
(initial funding year)

III. Completion Status:

____Completed on____/____/____

X Not completed

X In progress; Expected date of completion on / - / going

____Not yet initiated

Resources necessary for completion

IV. Additional Comments:

PROJECT ACTIVITY

The content of the training modules will be reviewed by the project director to ensure that each is concordant with the aims of the project and supportive of removing barriers to the performance of underachieving students.

January 17, 1989

/ 3/14/89

/ ____________

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

CANAL AUDIT: ENABLING ACTIVITIES

1988-89

I. CANAL Program Action: SG-1, OBJ-2, EA-8, EV-6 (pp.40-42)

EA-8

Beginning in Fall 1988 and continuing threafter, management staff in cooperation with the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs, staff will secure and assign staff to deliver scheduled training services at all school sites. Compliance with the schedule and the quality of the presentations will be monitored by Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs staff, as well as the project staff and appropriate participants.

EV-6

Describe and evaluate procedures for selecting trainers and the results of the process.

II. Completion Date: Original 08 / 31 / 89 (initial funding year); Revised ____/____/____

III. Completion Status:

____Completed on____/____/____

x Not completed

X In progress; Expected date of completion on / - / going

____Not yet initiated

Resources necessary for completion

IV. Additional Comments:

PROJECT ACTIVITY

Scheduled training at the school sites has been delivered by external consultants, Core Planning Team members, Project staff, other Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs Staff. Plans for these school site training sessions have been guided by Project management staff.

Project staff have guided and provided training in the process inherent in CANAL at the following participating schools. Clark, Piccolo, Lafayette, Gale, Manierre, Stowe, DePriest, Cooper, Dett, Jungman, Bradwell, Bennett, and DuSable. Attachments 25 and 36 are samples of agendas/programs reflecting local site activities with CANAL representatives presenting.

/ 3/14/89
/ ____________

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

CANAL AUDIT: ENABLING ACTIVITIES

1988-89

I. CANAL Program Action: SG-3, OBJ-2, EA-4, EV-2 (pp.57-58)

EA-4

The core planning team, including all members listed above will hold regularly scheduled meetings to plan and implement school improvement activities. (Ongoing)

EV-2

Evaluate the participation of the core planning team in developing a school improvement plan.

II. Completion Date: Original 08 /31 /89 (on-going); Revised ____/____/____

III. Completion Status:

____Completed on ____/____/____

____Not completed

X In progress; Expected date of completion on /- going

____Not yet initiated

Resources necessary for completion

IV. Additional Comments:

PROJECT ACTIVITY

Core Planning Teams are holding regularly scheduled meetings to plan and implement school improvement activities. Meetings will continue as one form of communication, throughout the schools' participation in the Project. Continuous planning and governance of the plan are responsibilities of the Core Planning Team. Attachment 50 represents the structure and meeting schedule of a sample participating school.

January 17, 1989

/ 3/14/89

/ ____________

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

CANAL AUDIT: ENABLING ACTIVITIES

1988-89

I. CANAL Program Action: SD. GEV-II, EA-1, EV-1 (p.69)

EA-1

Participating school staff will evaluate each training center's module presentation.

EV-1

Report the results of evaluations of participating school staff.

II. Completion Date: Original Ongoing / ____; Revised ____/____/____

III. Completion Status:

____Completed on____/____/____

____Not completed

X In progress; Expected date of completion Ongoing / ____

____Not yet initiated

Resources necessary for completion

IV. Additional Comments:

After each training session, participants answer questionnaire developed by Department of Research and Evaluation.

Raw data reports are made immediately following completion of questionnaire. Upon analysis by Research and Evaluation, summary reports are made.

/ 3/14/89

/ ____

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

CANAL AUDIT: ENABLING ACTIVITIES

1988-89

I. CANAL Program Action: SD. GEV-II, EA-2, EV-2 (p.69)

EA-2

Random samples of teachers' classrooms will be used to observe and assess teachers' performance each semester by trained personnel.

EV-2

Report the results of the observations.

II. Completion Date: Original____/____/____; Revised____/____/____

III. Completion Status:

____Completed on____/____/____

__X__Not completed

____In progress; Expected date of completion____/____/____

__X__Not yet initiated

Resources necessary for completion

IV. Additional Comments:

As the focus of teacher effectiveness training is the outcome for next year, incorporated will be observation and conferencing training.

/ 3/14/89

/

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

CANAL AUDIT: ENABLING ACTIVITIES

1988-89

I. CANAL Program Action: SD. GEV-II, EA-3, EV-3 (p.69)

EA-3

Each semester a focus group of teachers and principals across project schools will be assembled to discuss the program and problems.

EV-3

Report the content and results of the focus group discussions.

II. Completion Date: Original____/____/____; Revised____/____/____

III. Completion Status:

____Completed on____/____/____

____Not completed

____In progress; Expected date of completion____/____/____

_X_Not yet initiated

Resources necessary for completion

IV. Additional Comments:

At meetings January 19, January 26, January 31, February 1, March 9, March 10, May 9, and May 12, 1989, teachers and principals discussed program pros and cons. A continuation of meetings with principal, Core Planning Team chairperson, and school based evaluators are planned throughout life of project.

January 17, 1989

/ 3/14/89
/ ___

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

CANAL AUDIT: ENABLING ACTIVITIES

1988-89

I. CANAL Program Action: PT, GEV I, EA-1, EV-1 (p. 71)

EA-1

Appoint a panel of expert consultants to review parent education training modules.

EV-1

Report results of the panel's evaluations.

II. Completion Date: Original Ongoing/___; Revised ___/___/___

III. Completion Status:

___Completed on ___/___/___

___Not completed

X In progress; expected date of completion Ongoing/___

___Not yet initiated

Resources necessary for completion

IV. **Additional Comments:**

Although the parent education component staffing has been delayed, Project staff have ensured full participation of parents who attend sessions at the Center. May 11, 1989, a training session specifically designed for all parent members of the Core Planning Team, served to motivate their participation at the site and the Center. Evaluation questionnaires were completed by parents after the training session, and reviewed by Project staff and staff of Research and Evaluation.

/ 3/14/89
/ ______________

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

CANAL AUDIT: ENABLING ACTIVITIES

1988-89

I. CANAL Program Action: G, GEV II, EA-1, EV-1 (p.73)

EA-1

Develop instrument to collect baseline data annually beginning Summer 1988 on school attendance, student discipline, honor-roll.

EV-1

Report the baseline data annually.

II. Completion Date: Original Ongoing/___; Revised___/___/___

III. Completion Status:

____Completed on____/____/____

____Not completed

____In progress; expected date of completion___/___/___

____Not yet initiated

Resources necessary for completion

IV. Additional Comments:

Working with staff from Central Office units, Bureau of Management Information, and Information Processing, baseline data collected citywide by these units, serve as a resource for Project CANAL and participating schools.

January 17, 1989

/ 3/14/89

/

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

CANAL AUDIT: ENABLING ACTIVITIES

1988-89

I. CANAL Program Action: G. GEV IV, EA-1, EV-1 (p. 74)

EA-1

Beginning year 1, develop forms to log volunteers and volunteer hours annually by participating school each year.

EV-1

Report the results of logs annually.

II. Completion Date: Original Fall 1988; Revised ___/___/___

III. Completion Status:

____Completed on____/____/____

____Not completed

____In progress; expected date of completion___/___/___

x Not yet initiated

Resources necessary for completion

IV. **Additional Comments:**

As schools develop their school improvement plans, those goals and objectives related to parent involvement and volunteers, will require monitoring and evaluation. Documentation procedures will be critical to identifying attainment of goal.

APPENDIX B

COMMISSION'S ANALYSIS OF DEEOP'S RESPONSE TO THE CANAL AUDIT LEDGER STATUS REQUEST

MONITORING COMMISSION'S REQUEST

On March 14, 1989, the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation (Commission) formally requested that the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs (DEEOP) provide the Commission with updated information on 78 separate enabling activities and evaluation statements included in the Board adopted CANAL application for federal funds. A response was requested by April 15, 1989. This response was received on June 29, 1989.

Information was requested of DEEOP via an instrument termed a CANAL Audit Ledger (CAL). Each CAL provided the narrative statement of one enabling activity, a relevant evaluation statement, and page references from the CANAL application. Each CAL requested the original completion date for the enabling activity, a revised completion date if required, completion status and, if not completed, a statement of resources required to complete the activity as specified in the CANAL application. Space for additional comments was also provided. The Commission herein provides its analysis of DEEOP's response. DEEOP's response is on file in the Commission office.

THE ANALYSIS

This analysis will be presented for each major CANAL goal on which CANAL Audit Ledger data was requested. These major CANAL goals are:

Program Goal - Student Achievement

Shared Governance

School-based Management

Staff Development

Parent Training

General Evaluation Efforts

Program Goal - Student Achievement

Information was requested on five enabling activities and six related evaluation activities regarding this CANAL goal. Responses were received for each request.

DEEOP reports that some information has been provided by consultant trainers and local staff to teachers and principals on tests and testing. Areas partially covered were standardized tests, criterion-referenced tests, teacher-made tests, practice tests and testing for students, disaggregation of test scores for instructional planning, and use of quartile analysis and student quartile standing for monitoring student progress.

DEEOP reports that none of these enabling activities or related evaluation activities are completed. It is anticipated by DEEOP that they will be completed by August 31, 1993.

The Commission understands that Project CANAL did not begin as anticipated, per the funding application timeline, as funds were not received until late September 1988. The Commission also is aware, therefore, that not all the training needed in this general area could be provided as planned in the Project application.

However, the Commission does not fully understand why it will take until 1993 to produce training modules. Perhaps, DEEOP meant to indicate that not all training using the modules will be completed until August 1993. Surely the modules will be completed prior to that time. DEEOP should clarify the intent of this completion date. DEEOP also should indicate if it intends to produce the training modules called for by this CANAL goal.

Shared Governance

The Commission requested information on the status of three shared governance goals including 10 objectives, 47 enabling activities and related evaluation activities, and two overall evaluation actions. All were contained in the Board approved CANAL application. DEEOP provided information on all requests.

DEEOP reports that much of necessary structure to provide management, facilities, and other resources for the project including evaluation of training activities are either completed or will be completed by August 31, 1989. DEEOP also reports that all year one school sites were selected, training sessions prioritized for presentation to school staffs, and presented to each.

The Commission agrees that much has been done in this area and also understands why other activities needed to be rescheduled for the 1989-90 school year. Many activities are scheduled to be completed by August 31, 1989. The Commission will requery DEEOP as to the status of these activities at that time.

In the areas of team building and team planning for instructional delivery, DEEOP reports that core planning teams received training in these areas and reports that aspects of training were delivered on school-based management/shared decision-making. This goal was, thus, (partially met) for school staff. DEEOP reports nothing on cooperative learning and teaching techniques. The Commission believes DEEOP should relate progress in these areas. The Commission will inquire.

DEEOP does not directly report on the degree to which principals are observing teachers, providing feedback regarding classroom observations, and maintaining logs of such observations. The Commission believes more attention is needed in this area than the DEEOP response seems to indicate is warranted.

DEEOP's response indicates that objective two of shared governance goal two, regarding teacher peer support groups in project schools, did not receive much attention at all during 1988-89. Its response does not indicate what, if any, direct training, peer support, or observational follow-up will occur in 1989-90. The Commission is confused by DEEOP's response in this area and will seek out a discussion with project staff to determine how they have interpreted the meaning of this particular CANAL objective and elicit their specific plans for attaining it. Such specificity does not now exist.

DEEOP reports that each school has an identified parent liaison and has provided the name of each such liaison. DEEOP further reports the nature of the various activities these liaisons have performed with parents and parent groups. The Commission agrees that efforts have been made in this area. As the project management staff becomes 100 percent staffed, these liaison staff members should receive more help in planning and conducting parent activities. The Commission will follow-up on this notion.

In the area of intercultural understanding and racial and ethnic differences, DEEOP reports that training has occurred and that programs targeted at these important areas will be contained in forthcoming school improvement plans. The Commission will monitor each school improvement plan for appropriate content in this area. But, the Commission is not aware of any evaluation effort occurring in this area. It will inquire as to the degree of evaluation effort that has occurred thus far. DEEOP's response does not reflect on evaluation of changes in multicultural understanding or ethnic and racial differences.

DEEOP reports and the Commission concurs that: (1) principals have been given training in leadership skills, shared decision-making and related skills; (2) teachers and principals have received training in effective communication skills and formative evaluation strategies on instruction; (3) simulated shared decision-making activities have occurred; (4) training was given to school staff and others on budget allocations; (5) the Parent Education Center was used to provide parents with training on shared decision-making; and as well (6) core planning team members received training in shared decision-making.

The Commission is not convinced that the procedure described by DEEOP in this response regarding the monitoring of the use of shared decision-making skills by school staff in addressing school issues is the procedure that is required. In fact, the Commission is convinced no process exists and will enter into discussion with CANAL staff regarding this conviction.

With regard to the creation of core planning teams and the degree to which they are functioning, DEEOP reports and the Commission concurs that each project school has a core planning team that is meeting and is progressing. Whether or not these teams are able to produce, monitor, manage, and amend school action plans is the ultimate test; a test the Commission and DEEOP await together.

School-Based Management

Information was requested on the status of three general evaluation areas related to this project goal. The request included five enabling activities and related evaluation actions. DEEOP responded to each request.

The Commission is convinced that the perspective of core team members regarding CANAL activities is being surveyed and used in an evaluative sense. The Commission also concurs with the DEEOP response that core planning teams are submitting reports on their actions and activities more often than once a quarter.

However, the Commission does not believe that the project followed appropriate procedures in evaluating the content of the modules used in school-based management training. No outside panel of experts was appointed, no evaluation of training modules was performed by any such group, and no follow-up on expert recommendations for altering modules occurred. The Commission notes that such activities were performed by local staff and intends to solicit the results of the evaluative efforts as none were provided as attachments to this DEEOP response.

Staff Development

A status response was requested on the current standing of two general evaluation efforts related to this goal that included four enabling activities related to staff development. DEEOP provided responses to all requests.

DEEOP reports with Commission concurrence that teachers and school staff are meeting project-wide at least once a semester to discuss the progress of CANAL and that school staff are evaluating the effectiveness of training modules. The Commission also agrees that the 1989-90 school year is soon enough to begin to analyze teacher performance in the classroom.

The Commission does not agree that training modules were evaluated by a panel of experts prior to being presented to school staff members, teachers, and principals.

Yes, they were evaluated after such presentation by the audience. But, DEEOP did not follow the proposed procedures in an a priori evaluation of each module.

Parent Training

The Commission requested status updates on two general evaluation efforts related to this area. DEEOP responded to both requests and the Commission understands that the implementation of this particular component has been delayed. The Commission will renew this status request at a future date.

General Evaluation Efforts

The Commission requested and DEEOP provided responses on the status of four general evaluation actions related to the Project CANAL. The Commission senses that appropriate baseline data is being collected with regard to CANAL schools, students, and staff. The Commission would have looked more favorably on a direct statement saying the data was being collected as proposed in the project funding application. It will ask for same in the near future.

The Commission awaits the design and use of the various process logs to be used to capture volunteer participation in each school.

APPENDIX C

MONITORING COMMISSION'S OBSERVATIONAL ANALYSIS OF PROJECT CANAL TRAINING SESSIONS

OBSERVATIONAL ANALYSIS OF CANAL TRAINING

Introduction

The following is a summary of the analysis of observations made by the staff of the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation of the training activities that are a part of Project CANAL. Project CANAL is intended to raise the achievement of minority students in racially identifiable schools through cooperative planning and governance that involves principals, teachers, ancillary staff, students, parents, and community members.

Based on school-based management and shared decision-making concepts, the model is organized around a core planning team that represents the various constituencies of each school. The core planning team represents the nucleus in each school that is intended to lead the way in developing a model for school-based management. The observations reported here are of the training of the core team and are part of the Monitoring Commission's responsibility to monitor the implementation of Project CANAL.

The specific observational activities of CANAL reported here include: Orientation training; school-based management/shared decision-making training - day one; and school-based management/shared decision-making training - day two. These activities were provided for the members of the core planning teams of each school participating in CANAL at scheduled dates from November 1988 through February 1989. All of these training sessions were held at the CANAL Training Center, 4071 South Lake Park Avenue in Chicago.

Other training activities that have been observed but will be analyzed and reported for the next quarter include: Training for school-based evaluators; training for principals; parent's orientation; CANAL Advisory Committee meetings; and total site training (total site training involves an entire school and its staff). In addition, the Monitoring Commission staff observed the preparation of a cadre of substitute teachers who move from school to school to relieve teachers and staff who are participating in total site training. The observations included the training of the cadre as well as their actual performance as substitutes in the participating schools.

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATIONS

Program's Purpose

The purpose of the core planning team orientation sessions was to provide core members with an overview of the purpose and goals of Project CANAL and to explain the role of the core planning team. There were two presentations in the morning of the one-day training session: an overview of CANAL presented by CANAL staff, and a presentation by an outside consultant on differing perceptions of reality, the validity of different perceptions, and the value of understanding the views of others in developing a cooperative model for school management.

Then in the afternoon sessions, the core planning team of each school met separately to discuss specific problems in their school and methods for resolving the problems. The specific concern was with problems that interfered with improving student achievement. The day ended with a reassembly of the individual core planning teams in which each team presented a summary of their activities and achievements. Generally, the morning was given to providing the core teams with content, while the afternoon was used for skill building using the content.

Staff of the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation attended the orientation sessions to monitor both the process and content of the training activities. The results of the observational monitoring reported below include an assessment of participant involvement, the training presentation, the afternoon group sessions, the materials used in the sessions, and the environment in which the training took place. A total of 12 orientation sessions were conducted in which 39 schools participated. Staff from the Monitoring Commission observed nine of the sessions involving the core planning teams of 29 schools. Three sessions involving teams from ten schools were not monitored because of difficulties that the Monitoring Commission staff experienced in obtaining notice of the scheduled training sessions.

Assessment of Participant Involvement for Orientation Sessions

The concept of school-based management is organized around the assumption that an effective educational environment is one in which all key actors participate in the management of the school, including ancillary school staff, students, parents, community members and other groups that can have a positive influence on the educational environment.

Each school was expected to provide a core planning team that represented all levels of school staff such as principals, teachers, clerks, engineers, lunch room personnel, and teacher's aides. In addition, the team was to include parents and members of the community.

Monitoring Commission staff evaluated participant involvement in terms of how well the above categories of potential members were represented. Table 1 shows their level of participation in the training sessions, while their behavior during the training sessions, and the apparent level of satisfaction of the participants is listed in Table 2

The representation of the key constituencies was not complete across the member categories for the core planning teams of any of the schools as seen in Table 1. Given that Project CANAL specifically is based on the assumption that the best way to improve the academic achievement of students is through shared management and decision-making that involves the key constituencies of the social system represented by the school, the poor representation of the core teams in the orientation sessions was surprising. It suggests that the initial effort of CANAL in organizing the core team was inadequate.

Also, it means that the initial training effort, orientation to the basics, was provided to core teams that did not represent the intended categories of participants. The compromise of the concept of CANAL at the very outset may have serious implications for the potential of developing a broad-based management model for the participating schools.

The groups least represented by participants were community members. Only 11 of the 29 core teams included community representatives and of these, seven had only one such member. The availability of community support is central to CANAL. The majority of core team included parents, but as many as eight of the 29 teams involved in the observational study had no parent representatives present. Moreover, three teams had only one, three had only two and five had only three parent members in attendance.

TABLE 1

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATIONS

CATEGORIES OF CORE PLANNING TEAM PARTICIPANTS

Date And Schools	Principals	Teachers	Engineers	Lunch Managers	Clerks	Teachers' Aides	Parents	Community Members	Total
11/3/88									
Bennett	1	10			1		2		14
Dett	1	5	1	2	1		4		14
Hammond	1	10		1		1	3		16
Howe	—	15	1	1	1	1	2	—	21
Total	3	40	2	4	3	2	11	0	65
11/7/88									
Dyett	1	13				1	4		19
Terrell	1	14		1		1		4	21
Woodson	1	12	1	1	1	—	6	1	23
Total	3	39	1	2	1	2	10	5	63
11/9/88									
DuBois	1	15		1					17
Dumas	1	13	1			1	6		22
Gale	1	15	—	—	1	1	3	—	21
Total	3	43	1	1	1	2	9	0	60
11/10/88									
Byford	1	10				1	1		13
DePriest	1	11	1	1		1	4	1	20
Gregory	1	8					1		10
Mayo	1	8	1	1	1	—	5	1	18
Total	4	37	2	2	1	2	11	2	61
11/14/88									
Bass	1	12				1	1	1	16
Goldblatt	2	12	1	1	1	1	3		21
Piccolo	1	18	—	—	—	1	4	—	24
Total	4	42	1	1	1	3	8	1	61

TABLE 1 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATIONS

CATEGORIES OF CORE PLANNING TEAM PARTICIPANTS

Date And Schools	Principals	Teachers	Engineers	Lunch Managers	Clerks	Teachers' Aides	Parents	Community Members	Total
11/15/88									
Fernwood	1	9							10
Guggenheim	1	10			1	1			13
Manierre	1	5	1	1	1	1	4	3	17
Williams	—	15	1	—	1	2	3	2	24
Total	3	39	2	1	3	4	7	5	64
11/16/88									
Dusable	0	32	0	0	0	1	2	1	36
11/21/88									
Carter	1	11					6	4	22
Lafayette	1	15	1	1		1			19
Stowe	1	9	—	1	—	1	—	—	12
Total	3	35	1	2	0	2	6	4	53
11/22/88									
Kelvyn Park	1	16		1				1	19
Orr	1	8			1	1		1	12
Robeson	1	12	1	1	1		3		19
Westinghouse	1	12	—	—	1	1	4	—	19
	4	48	1	2	3	2	7	2	69

Given the important role that parents play in the educational process, the inadequate representation was disappointing.

In three instances, principals were not available to represent their schools. While perfect attendance on their part is not likely, in that emergencies can arise, it must be a high priority for them. If they cannot attend, a substitute should be appointed to represent the principal's office on the core planning team. Ancillary school staff were only modestly represented, again suggesting that the representation of the intended constituencies on the core planning teams was a serious problem during orientation training. (See Table 1).

Participants engaged readily in the orientation sessions. They were interested, often enthusiastic, and while on occasion they seemed determined to use the sessions to satisfy their own agendas unrelated to CANAL, their genuine concern was apparent, Table 2.

On a few occasions, some of the parents withdrew from the process and were passive. When questioned, the passive parents indicated that they felt inadequate to participate in the discussion. Efforts were made to convince them that their ideas and information were an important part of the school-based management concept.

Most attendees behaved appropriately during the training sessions, Table 2. However, during one session, a number of the attendees exhibited poor behavior by not participating in activities and being disruptive to the process. The trainers did not seem prepared to deal with the situation and a valuable training opportunity was lost. Trainers should anticipate such occurrences and must prepare to reshape the process to allow for productive activity.

TABLE 2

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATIONS

ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT

Date And Schools	Number	Representation			Participation			Behavior			Satisfaction		
		Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/3/88 Bennett, Dett Hammond, Howe	65		X			X			X			X	
11/7/88 Dyett, Terrell, Woodson	63		X		X				X		X		
11/9/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale	60		X			X			X			X	
11/10/88 Byford, DePriest, Gregory, Mayo	61		X			X			X			X	
11/14/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Piccolo	61		X			X			X			X	
11/15/88 Fernwood, Guggenheim, Manierre, Williams	64		X			X			X			X	
11/16/88 Dusable	36		X				X		X			X	
11/21/88 Carter, Lafayette, Stowe	53		X			X				X		X	
11/22/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse	69		X			X			X			X	

The satisfaction level of attendees, as evidenced by their behavior, comments and responses to the training was quite high. Most participants seemed positive about the orientation experience and willing to become involved in activities to improve scholarly achievements of students.

Assessment of Orientation Presentations

The presenters included members of the CANAL staff, who described Project CANAL and the concept of school-based management. In addition, each session included an outside consultant who discussed the value and validity of differing perceptions of reality and the potential for cooperative effort in the face of such differences. Several different consultants were used across the 12 orientation sessions, resulting in some variation in content, style, quality and process. It is difficult to assess the impact of trainer variation on the orientation process.

The observational data included information on the qualifications of the presenters, the extent to which they were perceived to achieve their goals, their apparent level of preparation, and judgments on the overall effectiveness of their presentations, Table 3.

The presenters for all phases of the orientation evidenced appropriate qualifications for their roles. They appeared to be skilled presenters and knowledgeable in their topic areas. However, perceptions of the extent to which presenters achieved the goals of the orientation varied somewhat. Most seemed to do an adequate job of conveying the purpose of CANAL and involved the teams in tasks that provided them with opportunities to develop insights that would be helpful to the development of a model for school-based management.

TABLE 3

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATIONS

ASSESSMENT OF PRESENTATIONS

Date And	Qualifications			Goal Achievement			Preparation			Effectiveness		
Schools	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/3/88 Bennett, Dett Hammond, Howe	X				X			X			X	
11/7/88 Dyett, Terrell, Woodson		X			X			X			X	
11/9/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale	X				X		X			X		
11/10/88 Byford, DePriest, Gregory, Mayo	X			X				X		X		
11/14/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Piccolo		X			X				X		X	
11/15/88 Fernwood, Guggenheim, Manierre, Williams		X			X			X			X	
11/16/88 Dusable		X		X				X		X		
11/21/88 Carter, Lafayette, Stowe		X				X		X				X
11/22/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse		X			X			X			X	

Most of the presenters seemed to meet their goals satisfactorily while one was diverted from the primary goal of orientation to other topics resulting in a disorganized set of activities, Table 3. The extent to which the session goals were achieved appeared to be a function of the willingness of school representatives to participate in the planned program, and the ability of the staff and the presenters to manage the audience to avoid diversion. The session in which the program objectives were poorly addressed was characterized by a failure of the training staff to control the content of the discussion and the persistence of participants in focusing on extraneous subject matters.

The presenters appeared well prepared for the presentations, and generally, were effective except in the instance noted above where the audience was not managed in a manner to allow for an effective presentation.

Assessment of Orientation Group Sessions

In as much as the afternoon group sessions were instrumental in providing trainees with an opportunity to apply concepts presented during the morning, and to function as teams, they were important to the success of the orientation. The individual group sessions, made up of the core planning teams of each school, were evaluated in terms of whether they achieved their goals, the reception of their report by participants from other groups, the quality of their discussion and the quality of the effort of the group consultant or facilitator, Table 4.

Most of the nine core planning teams observed by the monitors achieved their objectives in a satisfactory manner. As Table 4 shows, each training session involved

TABLE 4

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATIONS
ASSESSMENT OF GROUP SESSIONS

Date And Schools	Goal Achievement			Reception By Participants			Quality			Consultant Availability		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/3/88 Bennett, Dett, Hammond, Howe			X		X				X			X
11/7/88 Dyett, Terrell, Woodson		X			X			X			X	
11/9/88 Dubois, Dumas. Gale	X			X			X			X		
11/10/88 Byford, DePriest, Gregory, Mayo	X			X			X			X		
11/14/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Piccolo		X			X				X		X	
11/15/88 Fernwood, Guggenheim, Manierre, Williams	X			X			X			X		
11/16/88 Dusable	X			X			X			X		
11/21/88 Carter, Lafayette, Stowe			X			X			X			X
11/22/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse	afternoon sessions were not monitored											

three or four schools and each had their own group session. Only one of the core teams of each session could be observed by members of the Monitoring Commission staff. Thus, the evaluation of individual sessions represents only one of the three or four teams participating in the training on that particular day.

Two of the nine observed core teams failed because of the participants' inability to focus on the group task and the failure of the facilitators to manage the group process effectively. The reception of the core team reports generally was satisfactorily except for one session. Table 4 indicates that the session involving the teams from Carter, Lafayette and Stowe generally was ineffective and rated as poor across all assessment categories.

The overall quality of the group activity was rated as poor in three instances and good in only four. The training teams appeared to experience their greatest difficulties in dealing with the group activities of the orientation sessions. Consultant availability was rated as good in only four sessions, poor in two, with the remaining three being average. The consultants appeared least prepared to manage the groups and help the individual members participate fully in the group sessions.

Assessment of Orientation Training Materials

Training materials are important to the success of any training venture. The materials for the orientation sessions were evaluated in terms of their appropriateness, quality, their application or use in the training session, and the extent to which the audience found them satisfactory, Table 5.

TABLE 5

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATIONS
ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Date And Schools	Appropriateness			Quality			Application			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/3/88 Bennett, Dett, Hammond, Howe		X			X			X			X	
11/7/88 Dyett, Terrell, Woodson		X			X			X			X	
11/9/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale		X			X			X			X	
11/10/88 Byford, DePriest, Gregory, Mayo		X			X			X			X	
11/14/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Piccolo		X			X			X			X	
11/15/88 Fernwood, Guggenheim, Manierre, Williams		X			X			X			X	
11/16/88 Dusable		X			X			X			X	
11/21/88 Carter, Lafayette, Stowe		X			X			X			X	
11/22/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse		X			X			X			X	

The materials across all sessions were acceptable, but not of particularly good quality. While the content of the materials appeared appropriate to the goals of the session, the general quality of the material was marginal. Thus, the handouts contained typing errors, misspellings and often copies distributed to the audience were difficult to read. The use of blackboards and video materials was compromised by inappropriate or malfunctioning equipment, poor preparation or inadequate attention to detail. The training materials were used appropriately by the trainers and the trainees did not appear to have difficulty in comprehending them.

Given the emphasis of CANAL on high standards or educational achievement for all students, future training activities should emphasize high standards for the quality of training materials. The quality of the training process and the performance of the CANAL staff is likely to have a major impact on the perception that members of the core teams have of excellence and the extent to which the program is effective.

Assessment of the Educational Environment During Orientation

The physical environment in which training takes place is important at least to the extent that it should not interfere with process and activities of the training endeavor. Aspects of the physical environment that were evaluated included general physical arrangements, the level of comfort in terms of temperature and air quality , and the noise level, Table 6.

The environment left some to be desired, but it was adequate. For example, total group sessions were held in an auditorium that was too large for the audience, the

TABLE 6

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATIONS

ASSESSMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Date And Schools	Physical Arrangements			Comfort Level			Noise Level		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/3/88 Bennett, Dett, Hammond, Howe		X			X			X	
11/7/88 Dyett, Terrell, Woodson		X			X			X	
11/9/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale		X			X			X	
11/10/88 Byford, DePriest, Gregory, Mayo		X			X			X	
11/14/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Piccolo		X			X			X	
11/15/88 Fernwood, Guggenheim, Manierre, Williams		X			X			X	
11/16/88 Dusable		X			X			X	
11/21/88 Carter, Lafayette, Stowe		X			X			X	
11/22/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse		X			X			X	

seating arrangements were more suitable for watching a performance than generating group process. The seats were somewhat uncomfortable and trainees tended to scatter more widely than was useful for teaching purposes. Presenters also had some difficulty with regard to presentational space and arrangements. The auditorium was reasonably comfortable with regard to heat and air quality as were the rooms in which the group sessions were held. The noise level was within appropriate limits.

Summary of Orientation Sessions

The orientation sessions represented the first major activity of Project CANAL and served as an initiation for the training staff. Also, it was the first activity to take place in the new training facility that was in the process of being renovated to provide Project CANAL with a primary training site. The renovations still were underway and limited somewhat the orientation session activities.

The orientation sessions displayed some problems that may have major implications for Project CANAL's success. The difficulty of inaugurating a program as ambitious as CANAL would anticipate a certain level of confusion and unexpected problems. However, the extent to which the core planning teams fell short of the mark in terms of their composition at the onset of the program was troubling. The relevance of the core planning teams and their capacity to provide direction and leadership to the schools to the success of Project CANAL, mandates that immediate attention be given to the problems to assure the effectiveness of future activities.

School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making Training: Day One

Introduction

The second phase of preparing the core planning teams was training in school-based management and shared decision-making. The purpose of the training was to provide the core teams with an awareness of the concept of school-based management and of the techniques for shared decision-making. The training focused on making participants aware of the importance of mindsets that can serve either to stifle or create new visions for the potential of a school. Emphasis was placed on vision creation, human development skills, brainstorming new ideas, and the importance of process and consensus building. The nominal group technique was used to demonstrate the process of consensus building.

The core teams received two days of training, day one and day two, which were separated by several weeks. Observations reported here were for day one training. Observers from the Monitoring Commission staff were present for all of the nine sessions of day one training involving 40 schools. The training observations were assessed in terms of the participants, the presentations, the afternoon group sessions, the educational materials and the educational environment.

Assessment of Day One Participant Involvement

The composition of the core planing teams participating in day one training continued to display the problems of inadequate representation that was observed for orientation training, Table 7. Again, community members were least represented on the

TABLE 7

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

CATEGORIES OF CORE PLANNING TEAM PARTICIPANTS

Date And Schools	Principals	Teachers	Engineers	Lunch Managers	Clerks	Teachers' Aides	Parents	Community Members	Total
11/29/88									
DuBois	1	12		1					14
Dumas	1	14	1	1			1		18
Gale	1	15		1	1		1		19
Woodson	1	12	—	1	1	—	4	1	20
Total	4	53	1	4	2	0	6	1	71
11/30/88									
Bennett		12			1		2		15
Byford	1	10				1	1		13
DePriest	1	11	1	1		1	5	1	21
Howe	1	14	—	—	—	—	—	—	15
Total	3	47	1	1	1	2	8	1	64
12/2/88									
Guggenheim	1	11				1	1		14
Manierre	1	3	1			1	7	2	15
Sherman	1	13			1				15
Terrell	1	21				1	2		25
Williams	—	15	—	1	—	—	4	1	21
Total	4	63	1	1	1	3	14	3	90
12/5/88									
Carter	1	11					3	1	16
Clark	1	9	1	1		1	1	1	15
Frazier	1	13		1		1	2	1	19
Hughes	1	10							11
Spencer	1	12		1	1		2		17
Sumner	1	8	—	—	1	1	3	2	16
Total	6	63	1	3	2	3	11	5	94

TABLE 7 continued

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY: 1

CATEGORIES OF CORE PLANNING TEAM PARTICIPANTS

Date And Schools	Principals	Teachers	Engineers	Lunch Managers	Clerks	Teachers' Aides	Parents	Community Members	Total
12/6/88									
Bass	1	11		1		1			14
Goldblatt	1	14		1	1	1	4	1	23
Lowell	1	11	1			1	4		18
Piccolo	2	18	—	—	1	2	1	—	24
Total	5	54	1	2	2	5	9	1	79
12/7/88									
Bradwell		10					6	2	18
Cooper	1	5				1	3	1	11
Dett	1	6	1	1	1		4		14
Hearst	1	9		1		1	3		15
Stowe	1	25	—	1	—	1	2	—	30
Total	4	55	1	3	1	3	18	3	88
12/8/88									
Dyett	1	15				1	3		20
Fernwood	1	9					3		13
Gregory	1	8				1	2		12
Hammond	1	10		1		1	2	1	16
Mayo	1	8	1	1		1	4		16
Moos	1	9	1	1	—	1	4	—	17
Total	6	59	2	3	0	5	18	1	94
12/12/88									
Kelvyn Park	1	15					2	2	20
Orr	1	10			1	1		2	15
Robeson	1	11		1		2	2		17
Westinghouse	1	13	—	1	1	—	2	1	19
Total	4	49	0	2	2	3	6	5	71
12/13/88									
Dusable	1	34			1	1			37
Lafayette	1	16	1	1	—	1	—	—	20
Total	2	50	1	1	1	2	0	0	57

core teams. Only 15 of the 40 teams had any community members present and of these, ten had only one such representative. Clearly, there is a substantial problem regarding the involvement of community members in the process of school governance.

While the representation of parents improved somewhat, it was still more modest than one would expect. Eight core teams had no parent representatives, six had only one parent member, ten had only two, and six had only three members present. The results indicate that little was done to improve parent participation subsequent to orientation. Apparently, shared decision-making through the core teams will not involve parents in many of the CANAL schools.

Participation among ancillary staff, overall, seemed to decline from what was observed in orientation training sessions. The erosion may suggest a waning of interest on their part, or perhaps, a lack of commitment on part of the school. Whatever the cause, the decline deserves attention. Two schools were not represented by their principals.

Those who attended day one training did not appear to achieve the level of participation that they had anticipated and some appeared skeptical of the potential of the CANAL initiative. In four of the sessions, participation was rated poor, while only three were good with the remaining two being average, see Table 8. Sessions that exhibited the most participation were those in which training staff assisted team members, step by step, in going through the process.

Maintaining the confidence of the core team members that CANAL actually will allow them to participate in school management is essential. Such confidence is not likely to be generated when training activities fail to emphasize participation.

TABLE 8

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT

Date And Schools	Number	Representation			Participation			Behavior			Satisfaction		
		Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/29/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson	73		X				X		X				X
11/30/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe	65		X		X			X				X	
12/2/88 Guggenheim, Manierre, Sherman, Terrell, Williams	90	X				X			X			X	
12/5/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner	94		X			X			X			X	
12/6/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Lowell, Piccolo	79	X			X					X		X	
12/7/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	88	X			X			X			X		
12/8/88 Dyett, Fernwood, Gregory, Hammond, Mayo, Moos	94	X					X			X			X
12/12/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse	71		X				X			X			X
12/13/88 Dusable, Lafayette	57		X				X			X		X	

During one of the day one training sessions, a parent who was unable to speak English could not take part because a translator was not available. The situation should alert the training staff to take measures to deal with such problems.

The behavior of the participants was also of marginal quality in some of the sessions. In as many as four sessions, participant behavior was rated as poor, while only two sessions exhibited good behavior. The character of the participants' behavior was reflected further in their level of satisfaction, for only in one instance was it rated as good while the remainder equally were divided between average and poor (See Table 8).

Assessment of Day One Presentations

The qualifications of the presenters appeared to be good overall as seen in Table 9. However, a number of different trainers were used across nine sessions. Some were more experienced in school-based management techniques and were much more effective as trainers. Trainers less conversant with the techniques of school-based management and shared decision-making tended to lose the audience early in the training process.

The variation in the trainers' abilities meant that core teams did not have the same educational experience. The effect that this variation will have on the capabilities of the core planning teams and on CANAL for a long term is open to speculation.

As many as two of the nine sessions were rated as poor in achieving the goals of the training, only two were rated as good, and the remaining five as average as seen in Table 9. The modest achievement of the training goals were not particularly a function of the presenters in that their level of preparation and effectiveness as presenters was

TABLE 9

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

ASSESSMENT OF PRESENTATIONS

Date And Schools	Qualifications			Goal Achievement			Preparation			Effectiveness		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/29/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson	X					X		X			X	
11/30/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe	X				X			X			X	
12/2/88 Guggenheim, Manierre, Sherman, Terrell, Williams	X				X		X				X	
12/5/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner	X				X		X			X		
12/6/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Lowell, Piccolo	X					X		X			X	
12/7/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X			X			X			X		
12/8/88 Dyett, Fernwood, Gregory, Hammond, Mayo, Moos	X				X		X				X	
12/12/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse	X			X			X				X	
12/13/88 Dusable, Lafayette	X				X		X				X	

good or average. The problem rested in the effectiveness of interaction with the participants.

Assessment of Day One Group Sessions

The morning presentations included training in nominal group techniques for assisting groups to arrive at consensus in problem solving. The afternoon group sessions provided the core planning teams with an opportunity to practice the technique in preparation for their responsibility to inaugurate school-based management.

The importance of practice opportunity was not reflected in the quality of the group activities. In as many as five of the sessions, the quality of the group activity was rated poor and only in three instances was goal achievement rated as good, Table 11. And as many as four sessions rated goal achievement for the groups as poor and participation by core team members as poor.

Several factors may have interfered with groups in gaining experience in consensus building. A central reason for the inadequacy of the group process was the lack of competent leadership to assist the groups in developing consensus building skills. In some instances, group leaders were unable to maintain focus on consensus building, and problems were resolved by voting on positions. In others, the group leader, in some cases, the school principal, dominated the session and discouraged group participation. There was also a tendency for principals to take over if other group leadership was not provided. This did not seem in keeping with the CANAL concept.

Another importance factor was the inadequate anticipation on the part of the CANAL staff, consultants and trainers of the careful planning and management that is

TABLE 10

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Date And Schools	Appropriateness			Quality			Application			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/29/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson			X			X			X			X
11/30/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe			X			X		X			X	
12/2/88 Guggenheim, Manierre, Sherman, Terrell, Williams			X			X		X				X
12/5/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner			X			X		X				X
12/6/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Lowell, Piccolo		X				X		X			X	
12/7/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe		X				X		X		X		
12/8/88 Dyett, Fernwood, Gregory, Hammond, Mayo, Moos		X				X		X			X	
12/12/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse		X				X		X			X	
12/13/88 Dusable, Lafayette		X				X		X			X	

necessary for successful group activities. In addition, the group sessions failed to achieve a balance between giving the groups the freedom necessary for wide participation but maintaining the control required to achieve the goals of the group activity.

Assessment of Day One Training Materials

The training materials left much to be desired. As shown in Table 10, while the content of the materials was appropriate, they were of poor quality. As in the orientation sessions, handouts contained spelling and punctuation errors were difficult to read because of poor reproductions.

A video tape that was used was of poor quality and in poor condition. The tape had a glitch which caused delays disrupting the continuity of the training experience. Initially, only one television monitor was available and it was placed on a low table, making it difficult for the audience to see the video in the large auditorium In later sessions, a second monitor was added and both were placed up on the stage to make viewing easier. The agenda for each training session listed a video that was never used because of insufficient time.

The poor quality of the written materials and the inappropriate use of technical equipment suggests a problem in planning and attending to detail in the training program. Such inattention has a dramatic negative effect on the overall training process. Moreover, the implicit message to the members of the core planning teams is not inkeeping with the purpose of Project CANAL, which hopes to raise achievement scores.

TABLE 11

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

ASSESSMENT OF GROUP SESSIONS

Date And Schools	Goal Achievement			Reception By Participants			Quality			Consultant Availability		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/29/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson			X			X		X			X	
11/30/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe			X			X		X			X	
12/2/88 Guggenheim, Manierre, Sherman, Terrell, Williams	X			X					X	X		
12/5/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes Spencer, Sumner		X			X				X		X	
12/6/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Lowell, Piccolo	X				X				X		X	
12/7/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X			X				X		X		
12/8/88 Dyett, Fernwood, Gregory, Hammond, Mayo, Moos			X			X			X		X	
12/12/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse			X			X			X			X
12/13/88 Dusable, Lafayette		X			X			X			X	

The satisfaction of the participants with the materials was moderate at best. In three sessions it was rated poor, while it was good in only one session as shown in Table 10.

Assessment of the Day One Educational Environment

Each training session involved more than 60 to almost 100 participants, and for the most part, the training took place in a large auditorium. The seating and acoustics made it difficult for participants to see and hear what was taking place. Insufficient effort was placed on technical arrangements with sound and video equipment to compensate for the spatial problems. The temperature was also a problem in that the auditorium was either too hot or too cold, interfering with the flow of training activities, Table 12.

On several occasions, an intruder entered the group sessions, displayed disruptive behavior and had to be ejected. Noise, from a variety of sources also became a problem during the training session as noted in Table 12. While such problems are difficult to prevent, they should all be addressed with dispatch once they occur.

Summary of Day One Sessions

Day one of the school-based management/shared decision-making training was the first attempt to assist the core planning teams to be functional units for school management as anticipated by Project CANAL. For the most part, the sessions were only adequate and did not display the high professional standards for training that will be required to assist the core planning teams to become effective agents for promoting academic achievement in classrooms. In part, the inadequacies noted in the foregoing

TABLE 12

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

ASSESSMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Date And Schools	Physical Arrangements			Comfort Level			Noise Level		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/29/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson			X			X			X
11/30/88 Byford, Bennett, Howe, DePriest			X		X				X
12/2/88 Guggenheim, Manierre, Sherman, Terrell, Williams			X		X				X
12/5/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Sumner, Spencer			X			X			X
12/6/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Lowell, Piccolo			X			X			X
12/7/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett,Hearst, Stowe		X				X			X
12/8/88 Dyett, Fernwood, Gregory, Hammond, Mayo, Moos		X				X		X	
12/12/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse			X		X			X	
12/13/88 Dusable, Lafayette		X			X			X	

analysis may account for some of the cynicism expressed by participants regarding the potential of CANAL. Teachers, in particular, were concerned that this was just another burden placed on their shoulders that only added to their already difficult position as educators. Others express doubts about the program during the group sessions.

School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making Training: Day Two

Introduction

Day two was a continuation of the training initiated in day one. The specific purpose for day two was to train the core teams to motivate the entire school community to participate in improving the quality of the school, develop school-based management and shared decision-making skills. The assumption is that these activities will enhance educational achievement. The day two sessions closed with a very specific goal: to help members of the core planning teams plan how they could bring joy to their own schools on the following morning. The purpose of the effort was to assist core team members to consider a broad range of methods for improving the climate in their schools.

The training activities for day two again involved nine sessions for 40 schools. However, due to the lack of notification of training schedules, the Monitoring Commission staff was able to attend only five of the day two sessions. The five sessions that were observed involved 21 schools of the 40 schools. Moreover, attendance data were available only for the first four sessions. The analysis that follows then is based on attendance data for the first four sessions of day two and observations of five sessions, see Tables 12 and 13.

TABLE 13

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2

CATEGORIES OF CORE PLANNING TEAM PARTICIPANTS

Date And Schools	Principals	Teachers	Engineers	Lunch Managers	Clerks	Teachers' Aides	Parents	Community Members	Total
12/14/88									
Bennett	1	10			1		2		14
Byford*									
DePriest	1	11	1	1		1	4	1	20
Howe	—	16	—	—	1	1	—	—	18
Total	2	37	1	1	2	2	6	1	52
12/19/88									
Carter	1	10					1	1	13
Clark	1	10	1	1		1	1	1	16
Frazier	1	10	1	1		1	5	1	20
Hughes	1	10				1	2		14
Spencer	1	12			1	1			15
Sumner	—	6	—	—	1	1	5	2	15
Total	5	58	2	2	2	5	14	5	93
12/20/88									
Dubois	1	14							15
Dumas	1	11	1	1	1	1	3		19
Gale	1	13	1		1				16
Guggenheim	1	10	—	—	1	—	2	—	14
Total	4	48	2	1	3	1	5	0	64
12/21/88									
Bradwell	1	9	1	1	1		5		18
Cooper	1	5				1	2	1	10
Dett	1	5	1	1			4		12
Hearst	1	9		1	1	2	2		16
Stowe	1	22	—	1	1	1	1	—	27
Total	5	50	2	4	3	4	14	1	83

The training activities were evaluated by observers from the Monitoring Commission using the same categories that were used for day one evaluations including assessment of participants, presenters, group sessions, materials, and the educational environment.

Assessment of Day Two Participant Involvement

The attendance showed a slight decline overall for day two as depicted in Table 13. The greatest declines were in the number of parents and community members present. In addition, there was a decline in the participation of the ancillary staff. Only six of the 19 core teams had any representation by community members, and in those six cases, only one had as many as two community members present while the remaining five had only one. As many as five core teams had no representation by parents, and of those who did, three had only one parent present and five had two parents present. The total number of ancillary staff representing the 19 schools numbered only 13.

The attendance data indicate that the core teams are falling far short of the mark of providing local schools with a broad-based group that can effectuate the concepts of school-based management and shared decision-making. And, rather than gather momentum in terms of representing the primary constituencies of the school community, the core planning teams appear to be losing ground and threaten to become just another inservice activity for teachers.

During the first session, the participation of core team members was rated as good in five sessions and poor in one. The data may suggest that those who do attend are willing to take part in the process, Table 14. Their behavior and level of satisfaction was rated similarly, again suggesting that those who do attend have a positive approach to

TABLE 14

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2
ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT

Date And		Representation			Participation			Behavior			Satisfaction		
Schools	Number	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
12/14/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe	52*						X			X			X
12/19/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner	93					X			X			X	
12/20/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Guggenheim	64		X		X			X			X		
12/21/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	83				X			X			X		
1/17/89 Dusable, Lafayette	n/a				X			X			X		

*Attendance sheets were not available for Byford.

TABLE 15

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2

ASSESSMENT OF PRESENTATIONS

Date And Schools	Qualifications			Goal Achievement			Preparation			Effectiveness		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
12/14/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe		X			X			X			X	
12/19/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner		X			X			X			X	
12/20/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Guggenheim		X			X			X			X	
12/21/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst. Stowe	X				X			X			X	
1/17/89 Dusable, Lafayette		X			X			X			X	

CANAL. Of course, this is overshadowed by the poor representation of the constituents who are key to the process of shared governance.

Assessment of Day Two Presentations

The qualifications of the presenters were seen as average in four sessions and good in the fifth. The extent to which they achieved their goals also was average as was their apparent level of preparation and their effectiveness, Table 15.

Assessment of Day Two Group Sessions

The group activities for day two again provided an opportunity for core planning teams to come together and work on shared decision-making through consensus building, Table 16. The focus was on the original topic: How can we make our school better? While most teams appeared to achieve the goal, three were rated as good, and only one as poor, most teams did not apply the techniques of consensus building. Some did not possess the skills or knowledge necessary and trainers or consultants were not effective in maintaining the process as one of skill building. One group decided that they had enough training and left the training center prior to the conclusion of the day's activities.

Throughout the orientation, day one and day two training sessions it appeared that the opening day suffered particularly from poor organization on part of the CANAL staff and apparent confusion about activities and processes. The group sessions were especially affected by this problem.

TABLE 16

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2

ASSESSMENT OF GROUP SESSIONS

Date And Schools	Goal Achievement			Reception By Participants			Quality			Consultant Availability		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
12/14/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe			X			X			X			X
12/19/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner		X			X				X		X	
12/20/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Guggenheim	X			X					X	X		
12/21/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X			X					X	X		
1/17/89 Dusable, Lafayette*	X	X			X	X		X	X		X	

*Group sessions for both schools were observed and assessed separately.

The closing session consisted of teams reporting on how they planned to bring "joy" to their schools on the following day. Participants were enthusiastic in this task and generally, the sessions closed on a note of exuberance.

Assessment of Day Two Training Materials

The training materials were all deemed to be appropriate for the sessions and no particular problems were noted, Table 17. Their quality was seen as average as was their application and the level of satisfaction with them.

Assessment of the Day Two Educational Environment

The environment continued to be a problem. Temperature fluctuations were not remedied, and noise interfered with the proceedings in one session. At best, the environment was rated as average, Table 18.

Summary of Day Two Sessions

Day two of the training activities followed the inadequacies of the preceding sessions. The most disturbing observation was the decline in the participation in the core planning teams. Whatever the processes for maintaining the momentum of these teams, it is not effective. This failure to address the problem undermines the basis of Project CANAL.

While the training activities continue, generally at the level of an average performance, the issue is whether the quality of the training is, sufficient to prepare the core planning teams for a task that at best is difficult.

TABLE 17

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2

ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Date And Schools	Appropriateness			Quality			Application			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
12/14/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe		X			X			X			X	
12/19/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes Spencer, Sumner		X			X			X			X	
12/20/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson		X			X			X			X	
12/21/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X			X			X			X		
1/17/89 Dusable, Lafayette		X			X			X			X	

TABLE 18

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2

ASSESSMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Date And Schools	Physical Arrangements			Comfort Level			Noise Level		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
12/14/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe		X			X			X	
12/19/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner		X			X			X	
12/20/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Guggenheim		X			X			X	
12/21/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe		X			X			X	
1/17/88 Dusable, Lafayette			X			X			X

Conclusion

The purpose of the orientation, day one and day two school-based management/shared decision-making training was to prepare the core planning teams for their role in Project CANAL. The anticipation is that the core planning teams will represent the primary constituencies of the school including principals, teachers, ancillary staff, parents and community members. Further, the core teams are intended to provide the leadership that will bring about the realization of school-based management and shared decision-making. The ultimate goal is to restructure school governance in order to improve the educational atmosphere and increase levels of academic achievement.

The critical role of the core planning teams regarding the hopes for student achievement places a heavy burden on the shoulders of the core planning teams' members. The training proposed in Project CANAL is intended to provide core planning teams with the content, skills and motivation necessary to carry out their responsibilities. The purpose of the foregoing analysis was to assess, from an observational perspective, the training activities. Based on the observational evaluation, serious problems threaten the capacity of the training to meet its obligation. In summary, the following are some of the major problems identified through the observations of the Monitoring Commission staff.

First, the failure of the core planning teams to represent the intended broad constituency of the local school is in direct contradiction to the CANAL concept and to the explicit intent of the $83 million Settlement Fund proposal. Not only was representation a problem at the outset of the training of the core planning teams, but as the training progressed, representation declined. If this matter is not resolved and some remedial action taken to compensate for the past failures, other issues of performance may be moot.

Second, the general state of readiness and preparation of the staff for training left much to be desired. At the beginning of each training sequence, orientation, day one and day two, the consultants and CANAL staff appeared unprepared, and the overall process of training suffered from disorganization and inadequate preparation. Schools involved in the early sessions of each sequence were faced with an experience of less quality. As it turned out, nine schools were involved in the early sessions of all three sequences: Bennett, Byford, Frazier, Howe, Hughes, Sherman, Spencer, Sumner and Woodson. Likely, this will have an impact on the capacities of the core planning teams of these schools to offer the intended leadership.

Third, the group sessions were to serve as workshops for core planning teams to apply concepts and develop skills for management and shared decision-making. This was the weakest part of the training program. The challenge of leadership facing the core planning teams is awesome, and they needed all the help they could get.

Fourth, the training experience was characterized by the use of different presenters from one session to the other. The variation in consultants and outside experts who did the teaching was not accompanied with an obvious rationale in terms of the training goal at hand. Moreover, the presenters displayed considerable variation in their knowledge, the emphasis in their message, and their skills as teachers. Consequently, core planning teams were subjected to wide variation, with some receiving more benefit than others.

Fifth, the quality of the training materials did not meet professional standards. Inadequate editing, poor copies, video materials that were in bad repair, and inadequate effort to assure appropriate viewing and hearing of educational materials interfered with the training mission. Not only did it have a direct negative effect on the experience of the participants, but indirectly, it conveyed a message contrary to the intended goals of Project CANAL, to establish high levels of academic achievement.

Sixth, the quality of the environment was less than desirable. Poor control of room temperature, noise and marginal acoustics compounded the use of a large auditorium with fixed seating that was not well suited for interactive processes.

APPENDIX D

A COMMUNITY STUDY CONCEPT
CASE STUDY SCHOOLS DATA

BACKGROUND - A COMMUNITY STUDY CONCEPT

The Settlement Agreement between the United States and the Chicago Board of Education focused on relieving racially identifiable black and Hispanic schools of the effects of segregation. The funds availed through the Agreement were used to develop the Project CANAL (Creating a New Approach to Learning) which has the specific goal of raising the academic achievement levels of students in racially identifiable schools.

CANAL's Intent

The intent of Project CANAL is to develop a model of shared decision-making among the constituencies of the public school including parents, students, teachers, administrators, and members of the Board of Education. The primary activity of CANAL involves training the constituent representatives to engage in shared decision-making and to develop organizational structures that incorporate the support of the community into the organizational and educational processes of the school.

The intended practical consequence of CANAL is to develop a core planning team within the school that is made up of representatives of the constituencies. The core planning team will plan and direct activities for improving educational achievement. The specific goal of CANAL is to raise the level of achievement to a point where at least "50 percent of participating students in each school will perform at or above grade level in reading and mathematics as evidenced by scores on standardized achievement tests and will demonstrate increased achievement in other content areas."

Shared Decision-Making

While the advantages to the educational process of support from a broad set of community members and their direct involvement in activities within the local public school seem obvious, it also seems apparent that the shared decision-making represented by the core team within the school is only a small tip of a much larger community pyramid that makes up the social context in which the school is located.

Little information is available on the extent to which the broader community, its organizations and institutions, its leaders, its social and economic character, with its unique problems and special opportunities it presents, can influence the potential of the local school to achieve high academic standards. It is likely that communities who experience high levels of poverty and unemployment, high crime rates and other disadvantages also are likely to have schools that are less successful than more advantaged communities. Such community factors may present substantial barriers to the success of plans for educational improvement.

Intensive Analysis of Community as a Complex, Inclusive Social System

It is also true that every community, irrespective of its social and economic disadvantages possesses resources and strength that can be drawn upon to overcome what may appear to be insurmountable difficulties in promoting the routine achievement of high academic standards. It is important to develop information that can identify and suggest potential mechanisms for harnessing the resources that exist to provide formally organized and funded educational programs with the social and contextual support they need to succeed.

In response to this need, the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation aims to make a substantial contribution by undertaking an intensive analysis of the community social system in which the public school is located. The following describes the preliminary stages of conceptualizing the study.

THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL

An Action System Model

The appropriate conceptual model to direct the analysis of the school and its social context derives from system theory. The approach is based on the assumption that the relevant unit of analysis is the social system and its constituent subsystems, i.e., the organizations, groups and individuals that make up the structure and activities of the system. While the system of primary concern in educational achievement is the local school, the broader social system imposes limits on, or represents resources and opportunities for positive change that will enable the school to realize its educational goals. Thus, the analytic approach must describe the character and activities of the school; the structures and processes of the local community and its neighborhoods in which the school is located; and, the activities and processes that link elements of the school and the community.

Depicting the School's Subsystems

Within the framework of the social action system, the school can be represented as a subsystem that is bounded by its physical plant and made up primarily of the interactions of its key actors including students, teachers, administrators, and supporting clerical and ancillary staff. Each of these groups of actors can be described in terms of their personal and social characteristics, their roles, the activities they engage in, and the character of their interrelationships. Also, they can be described in terms of patterns of decision-making and the sources of power for decision on various levels of the organization.

The school may be viewed, however, as an inclusive system comprised of subsystems. The importance of the description of the subsystems of the school rests in the information it provides on the current structure of activities and the potential that the elements of the system present for initiating meaningful change and maintaining positive organizational goals. Bounding the subsystem of the school i.e., the inclusive system, so narrowly has the advantages of limiting the scope of considerations and allowing a detailed description of a highly relevant set of interactions.

Describing the School's Broader System of Actors: The Complex Inclusive System

However, it is immediately apparent that the narrowly defined subsystems excludes actors who are substantially involved with the daily activities of the school and who may have a dramatic influence on the content of activities and decision-making within the school. Thus, parents, parent groups, school organizations that involve outside community members, advisory groups, the school board and others represent actors who are immediately involved with the day-to-day activities of the school system and thus are constituent subsystems of the inclusive system. It is important to describe who these actors are, their social and person characteristics, their roles, their agendas, the activities that they engage in and the kinds of relationships and linkages they maintain with the narrower constituencies of the schools delimited as an inclusive system.

Again, the value of the description of the complex inclusive system represented by this broader system of actors relevant to the delimited inclusive system of the school rests in gaining insight into the existing structures and processes and developing means for drawing on their strengths to support the educational agenda.

This broader inclusive system represented by the actors just described captures a more complete picture of the forces that determine the destiny of a school, as well as the potential resources for introducing positive change and reducing negative influences on educational achievement. But even this broader group of more directly involved actors fails to capture the real set of actors who purposively or inadvertently may hurt or help the school achieve its objectives. The community system is made up of organizations including churches, businesses, political groups, public, private and voluntary community service agencies, and recreational and social groups. Each of these organizations has the potential to support the school in achieving its mission through a variety of formal and informal activities. In addition, communities consist of families and individuals who also represent key components of broader community system. The utility of describing the community rests in coming to understand the resources within the community that can be brought to support the school.

While the primary focus of the conceptual model is limited to the dynamic action system represented at the community level, representatives of larger social and political systems impose on the school's capacity to meet its responsibilities. Thus, the political decisions of city government, actions of the school board, and even state government, can impact dramatically on the affairs of the local school.

The utility of the social action systems model is that it directs analysis of the total set of interacting forces that impinge on the local school. Moreover, it leads simultaneously to intensive analysis of inclusive systems and subsystems with their internal operations and to an extensive analysis of the interactions between subsystems. This approach will provide information that may enable the school to be sensitive to their community's commitment to them and support an educational process that allows all students to realize their full potential.

PRELIMINARY RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design is organized around data that will be collected on three different levels of contained and containing action systems.

First, data will be collected that describes the constituent subsystems of the school. The variables making up this data set will describe intrasystem characteristics and activities, e.g. students, teachers, programs, etc.

The second level of data collection will be on the broader, complex inclusive community system in which the school is located. These data focus on the contextual characteristics and activities of actors and organizations external to the school that along with the school comprise the constituent subsystems of the complex, inclusive community systems.

The third level of data will consist of information on the structures and processes that link the narrow subsystem of the school to the broader systems within the community, the dynamic linkages between system and subsystems in the interorganizational field of the local school action system.

In general, the data set would include information that describes:

The School as an Inclusive System

- The school including the characteristics of individuals such as students, teachers, administrators, ancillary staff; performance-related characteristics such as achievement scores and measures, dropouts, transfers, special activities, college entrants; organizational characteristics including fiscal data, student-teacher ratios, special spatial arrangements; and, data on directly related support groups such as parent organizations and other groups.

The Community as a Complex Inclusive System

- The community including social and economic characteristics, special social, financial or geographical features, institutions, organizations, community leaders, individuals representing potential resources and other relevant information on the community. In addition, data on the broader urban and state influences on the school system would be collected.

Linkages in the Interorganizational field

- This third set would consist also of variables that describe the linkages between subsystems. While the linkages within the school system would be important, the more specific concern in terms of linkage data would consist of measures of those actors and activities that connect the school as a subsystem with the broader community, a containing complex, inclusive system. The intent here is to describe the activities and actors representing bonds between the school and the community. The information is crucial because it provides a picture of the behavior of the overall system and will expose the potential opportunities existing for developing a local school action system that is an expression of the communities' commitment to academic excellence.

While the availability of the data has not been tested on the community level, much of the information that is needed is available through secondary sources. The process of identifying these sources, the extent and quality of the data, and the types of primary data that will have to be developed in order to meet the needs of the project is currently under exploration. With respect to data on the schools certain basic data already have been identified as available including:

- Student Academic Achievement through Annual Iowa Test of Basic Skill scores;
- Annual Student Enrollment;
- Annual Dropout Rate;
- Individual Parental Participation;
- Organizational Parental Participation;
- Annual Faculty and Staff Turnover;

- General Staff Development Activities;
- Staff Development for Reading, Math, Science, and Career Development Activities;
- Proportion of Non-certified, Absentee and Substitute Teachers;
- Annual Incidence of Reported In-School Violence; and
- Annual Rate of Disciplinary Actions.

STUDY SITES

The study will be limited to three schools consisting of a predominantly black school, kindergarten through eighth grade; a predominantly Hispanic school kindergarten through eighth grade; and a high school.

DATA BASE: CASE STUDY SCHOOLS

Student Data

The purpose is to collect data on individual students. The data should be formatted to allow for a cohort analysis. The goal is to follow each grade for the time period of CANAL. The follow up over multiple time periods will help to create a trend line for evaluating change.

The cohort data should be collected for all students who are in the case study schools at the start of the study period. The start of the study period will be sometime pre-CANAL, depending on the grade of the cohort at the start of CANAL. Thus, the pre-CANAL period for students in the 8th grade will be a minimum of seven years (and possibly one year pre-CANAL), for 7th grade students it will be six years and so on.

In turn, each cohort will be followed for the Project CANAL period of five years with some modifications for advanced grades. Thus, it may make sense to follow 8th grade students only to see if they enrolled in the 9th grade, follow 7th graders through the eighth grade and see if they enrolled in the ninth grade, and so on. The first cohort to be followed through the eighth grade for five years would be those in the fourth grade when CANAL started. And this would be the case only in the K-8 schools. In the K-6 and K-5 schools, the same process would be used for the K-8, except we would only follow to see if they enrolled in the 7th and 6th grades, respectively.

The follow-up data will be organized around materials readily available and directly germane to changes in achievement. The data would include:

Student Characteristics

- Age
- Gender
- Race
- Grade level.

Other relevant data that is available on all students either the level of the local school of the central office and that provides information on student social and economic characteristics.

Student Performance

- Test scores for each student, retrospective to the first grade, and prospective through the last grade of the school
- Identify all students who leave the school prior to completion of the school's

highest grade and reasons such as transferring, dropping out, disappearing or whatever

- Record any disciplinary actions of record taken against each student
- Attendance/absentee data on each student
- Any substantial illnesses of record that would interfere with performance
- Special programs
- Involvement in school activities, clubs, etc.
- Special awards.

FACULTY/NON-ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF DATA

The faculty and non-administrative staff of each case study should be identified beginning at the start of CANAL. They will form a cohort for each school. The concern here is at least two-fold: (1) What are the faculty/staff characteristics?; and (2) Do they change over the period of CANAL? Again, the purpose is to follow the cohort over time and create a trend line for evaluating change.

Faculty/Non-Administrative Staff Characteristics

- Age
- Gender
- Most advanced degree
- Certification(s)
- Years experience overall in teaching in Chicago Public Schools, and in the CANAL school

- Additional data on teachers may be available at the local school level or at the central office.

Faculty/Non-Administrative Staff Performance

- Teacher stability, i.e., job changes and directional changes in specializations
- Appropriateness of present position to specialization
- Attendance/absenteeism rate
- Disciplinary actions
- Awards/recognitions
- Participation in staff development activities
- Past involvement in special programs, e.g., CESP
- Current role and activities in CANAL.

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF DATA

The administrative staff for each case study school should be approached as a cohort and the data composed of adequate time periods to provide a trend line for evaluating change.

Administrative Staff Characteristics

- Age
- Gender
- Race
- Most advanced degree
- Past experience.

Administrative Staff Performance

- Years experience in administration
- Prior teaching experience
- Career in schools
- Career in Chicago Public Schools
- Career in case study school
- Attendance/absenteeism rates
- Negative/disciplinary actions
- Participation in professional development activities
- Awards, recognitions
- Current role in CANAL.

CASE STUDY SCHOOL DATA

The purpose here is to describe the characteristics of the school and its organization. The data here will differ from the student cohort, the faculty/non-administrative staff cohort, and the administrative staff cohort data in that it will represent aggregate descriptions of the schools as an organization. The fit between the cohort descriptions and the aggregate descriptions may coincide at many points, but the aggregate cut will produce some new information. The importance of data over time remains to allow for trend lines of the organization that can be used to evaluate change.

Characteristics of the School

- Racial composition
- Aggregated student achievement data

- Aggregate faculty/non-administrative staff data
- Aggregate administrative staff data
- Aggregate disciplinary actions
- Reported violence
- Transfers/in and out and reasons
- Basic organizational ratios using number of students, teachers, staff, dollars, - special programs, etc.

Other information to be gathered will include: a brief history of the school; organizations within the school for all purposes; and organizations linking the school to community, parents, booster clubs, etc.

COMMUNITY DATA

The purpose here is to describe the community in which the school is located. The description of basic community characteristics must predate CANAL and follow the CANAL period to develop trends in the reshaping of the community to assist in evaluating potential changes in the school.

Community Characteristics

The description here may be based on various United States Census Reports for past several census periods. Purpose is to document basic changes and provide a picture of the socio-economic reality in which the school is located.

Community Organizations and Community Leaders

- Community leaders

- Voluntary organizations
- Political organizations
- Business organizations
- Religious groups and organizations
- Others
- Gangs
- Youth organizations that may be positive or negative.

CANAL DATA COLLECTION

We will use all relevant CANAL data collected by whatever group and particularly the Monitoring Commission's monitoring data to keep track of any and all program activities, intended and non-intended changes, whenever aggregate data are available.

COMMENTS ON BASIC ISSUES OF THE PROPOSED RESEARCH

Several issues are worth discussing in developing the case study design to monitor the impact of CANAL.

First, the most likely way to gather insight to the major changes during the CANAL period is by following the various cohorts and document change over time. However, aggregate data also are important because they provide information on what is taking place in the organization as a whole. Likely, the Board's Department of Research and Evaluation and the Department of Equal Educational Opportunities Programs will collect aggregate data. Commission cohort data will lend power in understanding the aggregate data and pinpointing more precisely where in the distributions of measured change the impacts have occurred.

Second, the major cost in data collection will be upfront in identifying the sources and evaluating those that are most useful. The additional cost of collecting the same time data over multiple time periods rests on enabling the Monitoring Commission to develop trend lines that will document change.

Third, we should identify a core of data developed for the case study schools that readily is available, easy to collect, and inexpensive and then extend our study to include intensive monitoring schools. These schools include three Hispanic grade schools, three black grade schools, and a Hispanic and black high school. The core of the data, may provide the Commission with an opportunity to broaden a base for generalization, thereby producing a much more convincing set of results.

APPENDIX E

MONITORING COMMISSION'S REVIEW OF THE CANAL EVALUATION DESIGN IN THE JANUARY 1989 QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

INTRODUCTION

This is the first of two Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation staff reports reviewing and comparing the first-year revised evaluation design in the January 1989 CANAL Quarterly Progress Report with the original evaluation design of Project CANAL contained in the April 13, 1988, Settlement Fund Proposal.

In the January 1989, CANAL, Quarterly Progress Report, the Department of Research and Evaluation (R & E) provides a revised evaluation design for the first year of CANAL activity. This revision is found in Appendix XI of the referenced document. R & E lists ten questions it proposes to ask of project training activity and five it would ask of project school-level planning activity. It also supplies a non-specific methodology section, a specific section on evaluation procedures, a section describing evaluation instruments, a description of reporting procedures to be used, and a general schedule of evaluation activities. There is a level of disjointed language in this appendix.

For example, there is an instrument reported in the "Schedule" section, Effective School Battery, not described in the "Instruments" section. Too much reference is made to forms used to collect data which are not defined as to specific audience or as to purpose. The questions under the "Focus" section speak to far less activity than succeeding sections embellish in terms of methodology, instruments, procedures and the like.

REVISED EVALUATION DESIGN

The R & E revised evaluation design is very general and speaks mainly to training, and the impact of training on the production of school improvement plans. Some attention is given to determining the viability of the core planning team and its ability to manage school improvement plans. Little attention appears to be given to effects of the processes on school climate and educational effects.

On the one hand, this response is to be expected. There is a lack of a set schedule of training modules. There is little advance notice to anyone from DEEOP or CANAL staff on the nature of which training modules are scheduled for whom, where, or when. R & E is placed at the same disadvantage as the Commission when it comes to planning assessments of training modules. R & E has responded to this somewhat cloudy set of circumstances with a generalizable design which, if properly managed, could respond to any training module presented and to all presented modules in a collective fashion.

On the other hand, this response by R & E is fraught with the opportunity for many events to go unattended. R & E's response is so general that they may not be able to be held accountable for the effort required by the content of the final version of the Settlement Fund Proposal. Too much is left to chance. R & E may have gone too general too soon.

In fact, R & E could argue that the Monitoring Commission's judgment is erroneous. If pushed, R & E could claim that many of these judgments are covered by their questions and are totally aware of what needs to be done. The Commission does not believe they are.

R & E has departed significantly from the original evaluation specifications. There is no direct provision for specifically tracking Parent Center activity. The same is true of the collection of baseline data. There are no questions dealing with this effort. The methodology section for year one is just as general as the first CANAL draft was. The Monitoring Commission is concerned that CANAL may have returned to "square-one" in this regard.

Bottom-line is that this revised design is just too amorphous, too elusive. R & E can, at times, dismiss any challenge with a response, "We're aware of that, its in the design; just look at question # ." R & E can also, at times, forget to do something required of the proposal because this design is so general it does not trigger reflective thought as to whether or not they have covered-all-the-bases. You do not do your homework when you forget you had an assignment due. You can only ask for a make-up assignment. In this case there can be no make-up. The event is gone forever.

Regardless, the Commission must comment specifically on the scope and sequence of this revised evaluation design. The Commission recently has transmitted 79 CANAL activities to DEEOP which were to be accomplished in the first year of Project CANAL. The following is what appears to be the match between those 79 CANAL activities and the content of the R & E revised evaluation design. This analysis is both critical and conservative. The Commission does this to move R & E to a posture of specificity. The Commission audit codes are being employed for the 79 activities to be used as the comparison benchmark.

April 13, 1989 Project Activity	January Quarterly Report R & E Revised Response
PG-1, EA-1, EV-1 (pages 33-34)	Training Question #3
EA-2, EV-2	Training Question #3
EA-2, EV-3	Training Question #3
EA-2, EV-4	Training Question #7
EA-3, EV-5	Training Question #7
EA-4, EV-6	None
EA-5, EV-6	Training Question #3

The above match is valid to the degree that the appropriate training modules are developed and presented. There is no provision in the R & E evaluation design to elicit from CANAL the existence of the products required of this project goal.

SG-1, Obj-1, EA-1, EV-1 (pages 35-38)	None
EA-2, EV-2	None
EA-3, EV-2	None
EA-4, EV-3	None
EA-5, EV-4	Training Questions #2 and #3
EA-6, EV-5	Training Question #4
EA-7, EV-5	Training Question #4
EA-8, EV-5	Training Questions #3 and #4
EA-9, EV-5	Training Questions #3 and #4
OR Lev-6	Appendix XI, *en toto*
OR Lev-7	Evaluation Procedure #1

The above match is valid to the degree that the appropriate training modules are developed and presented.

SG-1, Obj-2, EA-1, EV-1 (pages 39-42)	None
EA-2, EV-2	None
EA-3, -	None
EA-4, EV-3	Training Question #2
EA-5, EV-4	Training Question #4
EA-6, EV-5	Training Questions #2, 3, 4
EA-7, EV-6	Training Questions #2, 3, 4
EA-8, EV-6	Training Question #4
EA-9, EV-7	Training Question #3

The above match is valid to the degree that the appropriate training modules and training procedures are created and initiated. R & E needs to reassess whether or not project management actions need to be confirmed.

SG-1, Obj-3, EA-1, EV-1 (pages 43-44)	Training Question #3
EA-2, EV-1	Training Question #3
EA-3, EV-2	Training Question #7
EA-4, EV-3	None
EA-5, EV-4	None
EA-6, EV-5	Training Questions #2 and #8
EA-7, EV-5	Training Questions #2 and #4

The above match is valid to the degree that training modules related to the delivery of instruction to underachieving students are designed and presented.

SG-2, Obj-1, EA-1, EV-1 (pages 45-46)	Training Question #3
EA-2, EV-1	Training Question #7
EA-3, EV-2	Training Question #6
EA-4, EV-3	None
EA-5, EV-4	None

The above match is valid to the extent that training modules related to the creation of an effective learning requirement are designed and initiated.

SG-2, Obj-2, EA-1, EV-1 (pages 47-48)	Training Question #3
EA-2, EV-2	Training Question #7
EA-2, EV-3	Training Question #7
EA-3, EV-4	Planning Questions #2 and #3
EA-4, EV-4	None
EA-5, EV-6	None

The above match is valid to the degree that appropriate workshops and procedures are designed and initiated and are fully utilized by building principals.

SG-2, Obj-3, EA-1, EV-1 (pages 49-50)	Planning Question #3
EA-2, EV-1	Planning Question #3

The above match depends on R & E's ability to insure that such liaison persons are named and do carry out their responsibilities as required. There are no specific provisions in R & E's revised evaluation design to document this proposed sequence of events.

SG-2, Obj-4, EA-1, EV-1 (pages 51-53)	Training Question #3
EA-2, EV-3	Training Question #7

The degree to which the above match is valid rests on: 1) the degree to which a training module on increased awareness and knowledge of cultural differences is designed and presented; and 2) the degree to which appropriate classroom and school-wide activities occur. R & E needs to be mindful of the specific criteria which are a part of this objective when preparing and implementing their evaluation.

SG-3, Obj-2, EA-1, EV-1 (pages 54-56)	Training Question #3
EA-2, EV-1	Training Question #3
EA-3, EV-2	Training Question #3
EA-4, EV-2	Training Question #3
EA-5, EV-3	Training Question #3
EA-6, EV-4	None
EA-7, EV-5	Training Question #3
EA-8, EV-6	Training Questions #2 and #3
EA-9, EV-7	None

R & E needs to pay attention to activities occurring at the Parent Education Center. The above match depends on the degree to which appropriate training modules are designed and presented.

SG-3, Obj-2, EA-1, EV-1 (pages 57-58)	Training Question #3
EA-2, EV-2	Training Questions #6 and #10
EA-3, EV-2	Planning Questions #2 and #5
EA-4, EV-2	Planning Question #4
EA-5, EV-3	Planning Questions #1 and #4
EA-6, EV-4	Planning Questions #1 and #5

The above match depends on the degree the appropriate training modules on shared governance are designed and initiated, and on the degree that R & E remains cognizant of the need for local schools to document their planning and replanning of activities.

SBM GEV-I, EA-1, EV-1 (page 65)	None
EA-2, EV-2	None
EA-3, EV-3	None

Unless R & E uses training question #3 as an umbrella for this CANAL activity, this process of pre-training validation goes unattended by the revised evaluation design.

SBM GEV-II, EA-1, EV-1 (page 65)	Training Questions #5 and #9

Unless R & E expands the audience definition in these training questions to include more than "school staff," this CANAL activity is not specifically addressed by the revised evaluation design.

SBM GEV-VI, EA-3, EV-3 (pages 67-68)	None

R & E is aware of the need to assess core team activity (see planning questions) but this type of communication between the core teams and the CANAL project director may go unattended if not more specifically addressed in the revised evaluation design.

SD GEV-I, EA-1, EV-1 (page 69)	Training Question #3

This match is only valid if R & E accounts for this pre-training action under the umbrella of the cited training question. Such consideration may not now exist.

SD GEV-II, EA-1, EV-1 (page 69)	Training Questions #5,7,8, and #9
EA-2, EV-2	Training Questions #5 and #9
EA-3, EV-3	None

R & E does not pay sufficient attention to determining student perceptions in the revised evaluation design. Neither the training questions nor the planning questions speak to students. There is mention of students in the "schedule of evaluation activities." This is too limited.

PT GEV-I, EA-1, EV-1 (page 71)	None
PT GEV-II, EA-1, EV-1 (page 71)	None

R & E does not specifically address Parent Center activity in this revised evaluation design.

G GEV-II, EA-1, EV-1 (page 73)	None
G GEV-III, EA-1, EV-1 (page 73)	None
G GEV-IV, EA-1, EV-1 (page 74)	None
G GEV-V, EA-1, EV-1 (page 74)	None

Other than beginning to collect student achievement in year two of the project, R & E does not specifically report how this baseline data will be collected or otherwise treated. These outcome data are important. They represent the school effects of CANAL. R & E must give much more prominence to this data-set in its revised evaluation design. Historic performance is the needed baseline.

This is the second Monitoring Commission staff report reviewing the CANAL revised evaluation design in the January 1989 CANAL Quarterly Progress Report.

STATEMENT OF EVALUATION PURPOSE

The quarterly report contains a statement of purpose for the evaluation in Appendix XI. In that the statement may go beyond or may not conform to the original evaluation plan, a review of the revised statement is provided. The restatement poses a series of "global" questions that will be addressed over the five year project period. These questions are stated in bold print.

1. Does student achievement change from fiscal 1988 to 1993?

This represents the ultimate goal of CANAL. The primary difference here rests with the omission of the original proposal's more specific goal of raising the achievement levels of at least 50 percent of the students in each CANAL school to or above grade level in reading and mathematics as evidenced by scores on standardized achievement tests and increased achievement in other content areas.

2. How do school profile characteristics change over five years and how do the changes contribute to improved achievement?

While the original proposal indicated that the evaluation would be concerned with school profiles and changes in them over time, there was less emphasis and prominence placed on explicitly determining how the changes contributed to improvement. The statement suggests a causal emphasis in the evaluation that may be difficult to maintain. Perhaps, it would be more realistic to control for changes and evaluate their association with differences in improvements.

3. How does the curriculum change to meet the needs of the student population and how do the changes act as catalysts to realize improvements?

The original proposal emphasized the need for the evaluation to examine the fit between needs of students and curriculum changes to assure that the changes seemed sensible, given the needs. It may be much more difficult to explain how the changes operate as catalysts for change.

4. Assess the educational climate of each project school and how CANAL affects the climate overall. What efforts are enacted annually to improve climate and support achievement?

From a research perspective, the evaluation design is inadequate to determine how CANAL affects climate overall. Such an effort would require a more sophisticated control group. It will be possible to assess improvements made in the climate that on their face seem to support improved performance.

5. How is each school improvement plan rated according to what is proposed to improve achievement? How is the plan implemented and monitored by the core planning team?

It is not clear what the ratings will be based on and how such ratings will be related to improved achievements. Is this a serious part of the evaluation effort? The second half of the stated goal is more realistic and consists of descriptions of how plans are implemented and monitored. It is not clear how the descriptions of individual schools will be related to each other and what their generalizability will be. At best, some typology of implementation activities and monitoring strategies will suggest guidelines for such future activities.

6. How does training in school-based management for core teams affect the development, implementation and evaluation of the plan for improvement?

It is not clear how an evaluation design could lead to the satisfaction of this goal. It will not be possible to connect the training to differences in core team efforts on improvement plans. It would be possible to associate team structures and activities to differences in plans and it was these types of associations that were emphasized in the proposal.

7. Have shared decision-making skills of the core team improved and supported their efforts to plan for school improvement?

This goal is realistic given that the evaluation effort includes a measure of differences in shared decision-making so that less skilled core teams can be compared to more skilled ones. The effort is compounded by the fact that improvement plans will be idiosyncratic. While this doesn't make comparisons impossible, some effort will be required to make them sensible.

8. How has the training of the core planning team and the entire community resulted in a quality improvement plan that will lead to improved achievement during each implementation year? Has training enabled each group to execute their role within Project CANAL?

This global goal is a collection of fairly complicated questions that are difficult to address with research. The issue of "how has the training" is virtually unaddressable. At best, research can differentiate training activities or outcomes and associate them with changes in improvement. It is not likely that any assessment of the training impact on the entire community is possible. The issue of whether training enabled groups to execute their roles could be assessed if similar groups without training attempted to execute the same roles. The effort required would not be justified by the utility of the answer.

9. How has the involvement of parent and community groups in the educational program changed during the project period and has it supported the goal of improved achievement?

Basically this is appropriate. The "how" beginning complicates the issue. The evaluation could develop some method for assessing the extent and quality of involvement, changes over time and the association of these to improved achievement. This is in keeping with the original proposal.

10. How was the core team selected and has it facilitated the development, etc., of the improvement plan and supported achievement gains?

Analysis of how core teams were created is an important part of the evaluation and comes directly from the original proposal. Whether it has facilitated development of an improvement plan is much more difficult to answer. Again, associations between selection methods, member characteristics, activities, and the like with improved achievement is possible. The form of the global evaluation statements suggests inadequate attention to establishing the explicit goals of the evaluation.

11. How were the cadre teachers selected and trained and in what ways have they supported the implementation of the training component?

This goal seems addressable with basic descriptive information. It is a necessary part of presenting the total picture of the CANAL implementation.

12. How did the data from the information base facilitate the identification of each school's needs so the core teams could develop and monitor the school improvement plan? How were the data from the information base used to develop and refine the plans?

It is not immediately clear what is the purpose of these questions. Perhaps, they are stated inadequately. It would be important to know if the information base was adequate to identify needs, or at least to answer questions about basic needs. Also, it be interesting to examine the association between identified needs and plans, and activities that are emphasized in the monitoring process. That is, do plans address needs and do monitoring activities focus on the adequacy of plans to satisfy needs?

The persistent use of "how" suggests a soft process approach that will provide a great deal of anecdotal information with less substance than needed to inform future efforts.

13. What were the common and unique characteristics of each school improvement plan; to what degree was each component of the plan implemented each

year; what were the annual outcomes of each school's implementation; and how did the plan facilitate improved student achievement?

This goal is generally in keeping with the original proposal requirements and represents the annual logging of progress. Again, the "how" in the last phrase is inappropriate and should focus on the association between plan components and improved achievement.

14. Did training in school-based evaluation enable the core teams to develop, monitor, implement, and evaluate their school improvement plan and to report efforts in improving achievement?

Again, this will be difficult to answer unless some serious effort is devoted to designs that will make comparisons with non-trained individuals possible.

SCHOOL-BASED EVALUATION

An important component of the proposed evaluation is centered on the concept of providing the core planning teams with the capacity to engage in their own evaluation. Thus, each school will be able to identify key variables and collect data enabling them to modify activities within their own schools.

It is not clear whether the emphasis on activities related to training local core teams in evaluation is in keeping with the original proposal. The Monitoring Commission suggests that the original intent was to provide the core teams with the capacity to engage in research-based management. The emphasis was in the nature of training them to use research data and to recognize the need for data to address problems and issues. The Commission should review the materials and observational notes on training sessions related to evaluation to assess the intent and whether the training has a focus that will be relevant to improving achievement.

FIRST-YEAR FOCUS

The report outlines 10 training activities and five planning activities that represent the questions that will be answered through evaluation by the end of the first year. It is difficult to know which of them have been completed, but would be relatively easy if the report forms developed by the Monitoring Commission staff were updated. In brief the activities are:

Training

- What is the content of the training modules?
- Identify training needs of local school staff.
- Do modules address identified needs?
- What are scheduling procedures of core team training?
- What are trainee assessments?
- Was training used to develop local school improvement plan?
- What are effects of training schedule on local instructional programs?
- What are follow-up training activities at each site?
- What is the school staff assessment of training and trainers?
- Did training enable use of data base and techniques for developing the school improvement plan?

Planning

- Is core team engaged in year-long planning schedule?
- Did they use information base and other resources?
- Do they have shared decision-making skills?
- Does principal set tone for shared decision-making?
- Are faculty, parents and community involved?
- Are planning activities documented and how?
- Are training skills applied in planning?

INFORMATION BASE FOR PLANNING

The report states that each project school will be responsible for developing their own data base. The data base will be a key source of information for developing the school improvement plan as well as data for the overall R & E evaluation. Perhaps, the Monitoring Commission misunderstood, but it did not seem that the primary responsibility of organizing and collecting the basic data for planning and evaluation would be left in the hands of individuals in the local project schools.

The report states that opinion surveys, completed by principals, teachers, students, parents, staff and community members; qualitative descriptions of the individuals schools; and systemwide data on the schools will be collected, maintained and interpreted by school-based evaluators.

This could spell impending disaster if the school-based evaluators are left on their own. Each school is likely to come up with an idiosyncratic data base with potentially large differences in quality, or R & E will have to invest an inordinate amount of time in structuring and monitoring the activities of superficially trained evaluators. This seems an extension of what the original proposal intended. It was the intent of Project CANAL to train local people to learn how to use, request, and not be mislead by data. It's quite another level of ambition to expect each school to carry out its own evaluation.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The discussion in this section indicates that the actual data collection forms will be developed by R & E and individuals at the local level will use them to develop the data base. While that provides some sense of relief, it still leaves R & E with a monumental task in managing superficially trained evaluators who are expected to carry out a data collection and analysis. The experience in attention to detail in collecting data will be difficult to transmit to so many local school evaluators.

SCHEDULE OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES: YEAR ONE

The schedule of evaluation activities for year one, 1988-89, beginning in the fall of 1988, provides an overview of R & E activities during the first year. It does not, however, replace the reporting format provided by the Monitoring Commission staff.

APPENDIX XII: DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS

While the schedule of year one evaluation activities describes a number of data collection activities, the appendix on data gathering instruments provides displays of only:

- orientation session, core team questionnaire;
- training session, core team questionnaire (November);
- training session, principal questionnaire;
- training session, core team questionnaire (December, January); and
- local school documentation - list of school programs.

The remainder of the instruments likely will be provided later.

APPENDIX F

MONITORING COMMISSION STAFF

MONITORING COMMISSION STAFF

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation principal investigator Dr. Mary E. Davidson is assisted by primary consultants and full-time Commission staff in monitoring Project CANAL.

Primary consultants are: Dr. Norman R. Kurtz, Dr. Calvin M. Smith, Jr., and Dr. Doris Williams. The principal investigator and primary consultants are all Ph. D.s and experienced in various aspects of research.

Staff assigned in whole or in part to monitor Project CANAL are: Dr. Regina M. Horton, Ph.D., Education, as well as Barb Leebens-Osilaja, Jesse Qualls, and Christy R. Spears. Other Commission staff assisting include: Helen Jackson and Ana Tapia.

Complete resumes for the principal investigator, primary consultants and full-time Commission staff appeared in the Commission's first quarterly report published in February 1989 and therefore, are not reproduced here. Additional copies of the first report or this report are available at the Commission's office, 1819 W. Pershing Road, 6th Floor East, Chicago, IL 60609.

APPENDIX G

BUDGET STATUS

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

PROJECT CANAL

FIRST YEAR

OPERATING EXPENSE	First Year Budget	Modification	Revised First Yr Budget	Encumbrances/ Expenses 6/30/89	Balance As of 6/89
Supplies	$ 3,000	$ -0-	$ 3,000	$ 1,197	$1,803
Consultant Services	148,000	(33,892)	114,108	113,310	798
Printing	3,000	4,200	7,200	3,420	3,780
Travel	9,000	8,000	17,000	15,271	1,729
Furniture/Equipment	3,000	21,692	24,692	23,757	935
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE	$166,000	$ -0-	$166,000	$156,955	$9,045

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
Project CANAL
First Year Budget Detail as of 6/30/89

General Office Supplies		$ 1,197
Consultant Services as of 6/30/89:		
Expended	$67,665	
Encumbered	45,645	
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances		113,310
Printing:		
CANAL Progress Reports		3,420
Travel Expenses:		
Hotel	$ 7,161	
Food	1,347	
Airfare	5,851	
Local	561	
Miscellaneous	351	
Total Travel		15,271
Furniture/Equipment		23,757
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE		$156,955